Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-139
Friday
21 July 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-139 *21 July 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

NATO's Altenburg Debates Akhromeyev on Soviet TV
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE 21 Jul] 1
'Offensive' Stealth Technology 'Destabilizing' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jul]* 1
Nuclear Weapons Detection Test Termed Success *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 2
Usefulness of Experiment Viewed *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 8 Jul]* 3
Disarmament Procedures With U.S. Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Readers Comment on Missile Destruction *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Apr]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Karpov Stresses Cuts in Foreign Troop Presence *[TASS]* 9
Korionov Praises East-West Military Cooperation *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 9
NATO's Woerner Security Seminar Speech Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jul]* 10
Foreign Ministry's Reshetov Discusses Emigration *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 27]* 11
U.S., Egypt Differ on UN Mideast Conference *[PRAVDA 18 Jul]* 12
'Positive Trends' Seen in UNESCO Activity *[PRAVDA 17 Jul]* 13
Ovchinnikov Advocates 'Common Asian Process' *[PRAVDA 3 Jul]* 13
NKVD Archive Said Key to Wallenberg Mystery *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Jul]* 15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh Viewed *[Yakubov on TASS]* 17
Yakovlev Receives U.S., Italian Ambassadors *[TASS]* 17
U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan Criticized *[Biryukov on TASS]* 17
Military Need for Stealth Bomber Questioned *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 18
U.S. Expert Testifies in KAL-007 'Trial' *[TASS]* 18
Sagan Call for U.S.-USSR Mars Venture Cited *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 19
USSR Chemical Weapons Experts End Canada Visit *[TASS]* 19

China

USSR-PRC Trade Commission Meets in Moscow 19
PRC Delegation Arrives *[TASS]* 19
USSR-PRC Trade Talks Previewed *[TASS]* 20
USSR Official Comments on Session *[Moscow Radio]* 20
Song Jian Delegation Visit to Leningrad Outlined *[Moscow International]* 20
Moscow Weekly Deplores 'Tragedy' in China *[Goncharov on Moscow International]* 20

Northeast Asia

General Moiseyev Cited on Japanese Security Treaty 21
Suggests USSR-Japanese Peace Treaty *[Tokyo TV]* 21
Comments on USSR Far East Troops *[Tokyo KYODO]* 21
'Source' Expands on Moiseyev Remarks *[Tokyo KYODO]* 22

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippine's Manglapus Concludes USSR Visit 22
Comparison of Gorbachev-Manglapus Talks *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 22
Economic, Technical Pact Detailed *[Manila MANILA BULLETIN 20 Jul]* 23
President Aquino To Visit USSR in 1990 *[Manila BUSINESS STAR 20 Jul]* 23
Rogachev Sees Off Manglapus *[TASS]* 24

More on Ryzhkov Talks With Singapore's Cheong *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 23

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah, USSR Ambassador Interviewed *[London TV]* 25
'Armed Opposition' Continues Afghan Conflict *[Andrianov on Moscow Radio]* 26
Commentary Views Iran's Presidential Candidates *[Krasnov on Moscow International]* 27
Commentator Interviewed on Iranian Elections *[Batyev on Moscow International]* 28
Indian Chief Air Marshal Mehra Visits USSR 29
Arrives in Moscow 18 Jul *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jul]* 29
Meets With Yazov 20 Jul *[TASS]* 29
General Kochetov Ends Visit to Kuwait 20 Jul 29
Seen Off by Kuwaiti Officials *[TASS]* 29
Kochetov Assesses Visit to Kuwait *[TASS]* 29
Postwar Situation Inside Iraq Highlighted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jul]* 30
Israeli Delegation Visits Soviet Union *[Jerusalem Radio]* 31
USSR Envoy-'Arafat Meeting in Tunis Reported *[TASS]* 31

Sub-Saharan Africa

Interview With South African Minister Cited *[TASS]* 31
Aid to Mozambique National Resistance Continues *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]* 32

East Europe

Jaruzelski Meets State Council Members 20 Jul *[TASS]* 32
Jeruzelski Faces 'Burden' as Polish President *[Moscow TV]* 33
Poland's Presidential Election Previewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 12 Jul]* 33
Zaykov Attends Meeting Lauding Poland's 'Rebirth' *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Correspondent Examines Romania's Economy *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jul]* 34

West Europe

USSR Reaches Consulate Agreement With FRG *[TASS]* 35
Gorbachev Greets Greek Party General Secretary *[TASS]* 35
Relations Between Greeks, Turks on Cyprus Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]* 35
USSR-Spanish Consultations Held in Moscow *[TASS]* 38
USSR Holds Talks With EC Delegation on Trade *[TASS]* 38

Latin America & Caribbean

USSR Greets Nicaraguan Leaders on Anniversary *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 38
Nicaragua's Economic, Political Problems Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Jul]* 39

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further on Miners Strikes; Some Settled 41
Kuzbass Workers Resume Work 21 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Agreement Reached on Some Demands *[TASS]* 41
Mixed Reaction to Agreement *[PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 41
Some Miners To Continue Strike *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 42
Work Resumes in Kemerovo 20 Jul *[Moscow TV]* 42
Kuzbass Update for 19 Jul *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jul]* 43
Situation in 9 Centers Detailed *[TASS]* 44
Strike Situation Roundup 19 Jul *[IZVESTIYA 21 Jul]* 45
Donbass Strikes Continue 19 Jul *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 47
Donbass Situation 'Cause for Alarm' *[TASS]* 47
Strikes Spread to Northern Kazakhstan *[TASS]* 48
Kazakhstan Miners Continue Strike *[TASS]* 48
Vorkuta Mine Strike Spreads *[TASS]* 48
Some Issues Resolved in Donetsk *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Unions Support Donbass Strikers *[Moscow TV]* 49

Rostov Miners Air Concerns *[Moscow TV]* 49
Karaganda Miners List Demands *[Moscow Radio]* 50
Coal Minister Offers Help *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Jul]* 50
Deputy Interviewed on Strike *[Moscow TV]* 51
Central Committee Discusses Gorbachev Report 18 Jul *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 52
Gorbachev's Concluding Speech at 18 Jul Session *[PRAVDA 21 Jul]* 76
Report on 20 Jul Supreme Soviet Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 79
Moscow TV Reports Session 81
Further on 20 Jul Meeting *[TASS]* 82
20 Jul Committee Work Detailed *[TASS]* 82
18 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 83
17 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings Relayed 85
Problems Facing Gosplan Noted *[Moscow TV]* 85
Delegates Favor, Elect Panichev *[Moscow TV]* 86
Nepotism Issue Brought to Fore *[Moscow TV]* 87
Ryzhkov Speaks *[Moscow TV]* 87
Kuzbass Strike Situation Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 88
People's Control Committee Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 89
Next Supreme Soviet Session Planned for 24 Jul *[Moscow Radio]* 90
IZVESTIYA interviews Yeltsin on Goals, Plans *[21 Jul]* 90
Estonia's 'Interfront' Calls for 21 Jul Strike *[Stockholm Radio]* 92
Ethnic Clashes, Unrest Continue in Abkhaziya 92
'Extremists' Seize Weapons *[TASS]* 92
IZVESTIYA Updates Situation *[21 Jul]* 92
Sukhumi Situation Said Stabilizing *[TASS]* 93
Ethnic Clashes Described *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Jul]* 94
Additional Rail Workers Deployed *[Moscow Radio]* 94
Economic Impact Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jul]* 94
Further on Unrest in Nagorno-Karabakh 95
Troops Withdraw From Stepanakert *[Yerevan Radio]* 95
Meeting Held in Stepanakert 18 Jul *[Yerevan Radio]* 95
Tension 'Diffused' *[Yerevan Radio]* 95
'Complex Situation' Reported *[Baku Radio]* 95
Situation 'Normal' Along Tajik-Kirgiz Border *[Dushanbe Radio]* 96
Novyy Uzen Curfew Reportedly To Be Lifted *[TASS]* 96
TASS Reports on 'Special' Militia Units 96
TASS on Interior Ministry Special Division Force 97
Petrovskiy Views World Ecological Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jul]* 97
New Leningrad Party Chief on Problems, Dialogue *[TASS]* 99
Lithuania Adopts Law on Peasant Farms *[TASS]* 99
Lithuanian Ministers Appointed *[Vilnius International]* 99
Old Names Restored to Vilnius Streets *[Vilnius International]* 100
Role of Restructuring in Moldavia Viewed *[TASS]* 100
Faulty Design Caused Jonava Fertilizer Accident *[Vilnius International]* 100
AIDS Center Established in Vilnius *[Moscow International]* 101
Commission to Investigate '86 Kazakh Riots *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 101
Kazakh Figures Issue Appeal to Revive Language *[TASS]* 101
Latvia's Vagris Discusses Reform in Party, State *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 20 Jun]* 102
Estonian Gosplan Head on Congress, IME *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 16 Jun]* 106
Medvedev Meets Estonian Scientists in Tallinn *[TASS]* 109
Problems in Armenian Aid Distribution Detailed *[Yerevan Radio]* 109
Turkish Delegation Visits Baku 3 Jul *[Baku Radio]* 109
Udmurtiya Supreme Soviet Opposes Factory Construction *[Moscow Radio]* 109
Academician Warns of Carpathian Pollution *[TASS]* 110
Drugs Dealers Jailed in Uzbekistan *[Moscow International]* 110
New Weekly Published for Crimean Tatars *[TASS]* 110
Religious Monthly Published in Ukrainian *[Kiev International]* 110

Economic

Collegium Supports Railways Minister *[GUDOK 11 Jul]* 110
Report on First United Co-Ops Congress *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 5 Jul]* 111

Agricultural

Bureaucratic Barriers to Leasing Deplored *[PRAVDA 13 Jul]* 113

Scientific

'Cosmos-2032' Satellite Launched 20 Jul *[TASS]* 115
Semipalitinsk Region Radiation Discussed *[TASS]* 115

Military

Embassy Official in Ankara Cited on New Soviet Ship *[Istanbul HURRIYET 18 Jul]* 115
Admiral Explains Reasons for Scrap Ship Auctions *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]* 116
Public Inspection Official on Arms Cuts *[London MORNING STAR 20 Jul]* 117
Statute on Officers' Meetings To Be Implemented *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jul]* 118
Chief Investigator Discusses MiG Crash Inquiry *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jul]* 119
Leaders Sign General Altunin's Obituary *[PRAVDA 19 Jul]* 119

NATO's Altenburg Debates Akhromeyev on Soviet TV

AU2107102789 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 21 Jul 89 p 2

["fy" report: "General Altenburg on Soviet Television"]

[Text] Bonn, 20 July—General Altenburg, chairman of the NATO Military Committee and thus the highest-ranking officer of the alliance, will be the partner of General Secretary Gorbachev's military adviser and former chief of staff, Marshal Akhromeyev, in a debate that will be aired by Soviet television on Monday [24 July]. This will be the first time the chairman of the NATO Military Committee has appeared on Soviet television. About 80 million Soviet citizens are expected to watch the debate. The discussion was recorded on Tuesday this week [18 July]. In a radio interview, General Altenburg, who was inspector general of the Bundeswehr before he assumed his present position, assessed as extremely positive the discussion he held with Akhromeyev. "I think we did quite a lot to promote future arms control talks. We determined the points of emphasis, and we found out in which fields the other side has problems. The more we know about each other, the more successful the Vienna talks will be," Altenburg stated. Asked whether he considers possible the "softening up, a rapprochement, or even a dissolution" of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, he replied cautiously: "This cannot be judged at the moment.... If the current political development continues, I consider it possible that one day we will have to discuss military issues as well."

Referring to the talk with Akhromeyev, he also pointed out that, above all, he had discovered points where NATO poses problems for the Soviet Union. Altenburg mentioned two specific areas: First, the fact that the NATO strategy keeps open the option, in case it is attacked, of first "setting a nuclear signal to end the war as soon as possible and not to have to continue it." The second problem for the Soviets is the alliance's navy, which is highly respected. The Soviet side had to acknowledge that NATO must feel threatened by the enormous military buildup that was carried out during the Brezhnev era.

Altenburg stressed that, like Akhromeyev, he assesses the chances of the Vienna disarmament talks positively. The figures suggested by both sides were selected in a way that makes an early agreement possible. There are practically no great differences. "What is more important for us is that we know where the differences originate, in the sphere of tanks, for example, or other areas, so that we have a good basis for talks," Altenburg added. "Another thing that was very important for me was that because of various necessities...both sides apparently want disarmament."

What was striking about Altenburg's remarks on his debate with Akhromeyev was that he did not basically rule out a third zero option, that means a renunciation of the modernization of medium-range weapons. Asked about the prospects for a reduction or even a third zero option in the sphere of short-range nuclear systems, he pointed out: "Prospects for a reduction are certainly good. Whether a third zero option is realized or not must be decided among 16 states.... As soon as the Vienna talks are concluded successfully, the problem of short-range nuclear weapons will be tackled."

'Offensive' Stealth Technology 'Destabilizing'

PM1707081589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor Major General Yu. Lyubimov under the rubric "At Readers' Request": "'Stealth': What Is the Plan?"; first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] TASS reported 11 July: The USAF [U.S. Air Force] has carried out another ground test of its state-of-the-art B-2 "Stealth" strategic bomber. Foreign publications earlier reported that it can reach regions deep in the interior of our country undetected, and they drew the following conclusion: "We shall see whether Moscow responds to the 'economic challenge.' As yet the Russians seem to have made no changes to their air defense to counter the B-2." What do our military specialists think on this score?
[Signed] Reserve Captain L. Shumov.

It is appropriate to begin a discussion about "Stealth" aircraft with an explanation of the essence of the new "strategy of competition" adopted by the United States in 1988. Its main purpose is as follows: to secure military superiority for the United States and its allies over the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries by improving weapons' qualitative parameters, embroiling the Soviet Union in economic rivalry, and exhausting it by forcing it into sizable military spending to counter the highly efficient types of military hardware created in the West using the latest technology.

The B-2 strategic bomber, manufactured using "Stealth" technology, is a classic example of the new weapons. The U.S. press describes it as the most effective means of breaking through the Soviet air defense system. The bomber can carry up to 20 cruise missiles, including ones with nuclear charges, and other munitions and is capable of flying at low and high altitudes and penetrating deep into USSR territory. The B-2's chief highly publicized feature is its special design which, it is claimed, ensures unobserved passage, undetected by radar systems, through the air defense systems' combat formations.

The publicity has tried to impart an air of enigmatic mystery to the Pentagon's new offspring. In photographs and on television the gigantic 180-tonne aircraft resembled a black crow with a small, tucked-in head, a broad triangular wing without a tail assembly, concealed motors, highly "streamlined", its armaments tidily stored in the fuselage. Special emphasis was placed on radar absorbent structural materials and a mysterious "black coating."

How should we view the expansion of work in the United States to create "Stealth" aircraft? "Stealth" technology is no surprise to Soviet military specialists. Information about the beginning of work in the United States to ensure a low radar signature for aerospace offensive weapons began to come in more than 10 years ago. Three directions could be clearly perceived in this work. First, aircraft began to be electrodynamically designed, that is, their shape was dictated not only by aerodynamics but also by the need to ensure little reflection or radiation of electromagnetic energy in dangerous directions, for instance, in front or behind. Second, special radar absorbent materials and also measures to reduce the motors' own radiation of energy began to be used extensively. Last, coatings that absorbed radiation in other wavelengths began to be used for the aircraft as a whole or their most "noticeable" elements.

Measures to combat "Stealth" aircraft are also well known. There is the simultaneous use of systems operating on greatly different wavelengths. There is the increasing of the level of automation of operations performed by air defense systems to reduce time wasted in information processing, transfer, and generalization, in understanding the situation, and so on.

The foreign press is also debating the use of flanking systems to locate "Stealth" aircraft from favorable directions. Another countermeasure is the development of new detection and position finding systems which employ the ground or spatial array principle [raznesennyy na mestnosti ili v prostranstve printsip] of transmitter and receiver operation. Military observers reckon that other measures are also possible. It is interesting that the U.S. press expresses a high opinion of our Su-27 and MiG-29 interceptor aircraft and also refers to experiments using satellite-mounted systems, which, according to foreign experts' forecasts, can detect and track objects in flight.

Back in 1980 W. Perry, U.S. assistant secretary of defense for research and development, said: "The term 'invisible' is only a metaphor. In fact the aircraft is not invisible. It is perfectly possible to get a fix on it if it comes near to radar." Those words are more realistic than the publicity tone of some articles. It is also important to take something else into consideration: An antidote has always been found to every new type of weapon. Naturally, the people against whom the weapons developed under the "Stealth" program are targeted can take a complex of measures to ensure sufficiency for defense and military parity. It would probably be naive to suppose that an increase in the complexity and cost of air defense systems will be the only answer to the appearance of attack systems manufactured using "Stealth" technology.

What worries the world public is something else. "Stealth" technology is a destabilizing factor in conditions where the rival sides proclaim the priority of defensive doctrines. The United States carefully conceals the specific results of its work to solve the problem of making its weapons undetectable, in particular, the achieved levels of radar cross section. The press cites opinions to the effect that reductions by a factor of up to 10-100 in radar cross section may be feasible (for mass-produced aviation and missile equipment). A reduction by a factor of 1,000 may be obtained for specially developed aircraft in certain frequency bands. The detection range for attack systems is reduced by factors of 2-3 and 6 respectively. Hence the unequivocal conclusion: "Stealth" is a technology with an acute offensive thrust, a means of rapidly increasing the effectiveness of aerospace attack systems. The United States and the USSR have a sufficient number of missiles in their arsenals for mutual destruction. So the new buildup in the strike potential of attack systems cannot be justified with explanations regarding Western countries' commitment to the deterrence concept.

In the prevailing situation, where a new round in the arms race has begun to emerge again, it is important to reveal the danger of what is happening, especially as much of the work is classified and there is only superficial information about it. Experience of the talks on limiting antiballistic missile defense systems, on strategic offensive arms, and on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles shows the correctness of the path whereby either ceilings on the technical upgrading of weapons are established or permitted quantities and spheres for development and use are stipulated. These limits act as the main deterrent factors and facilitate verification.

Such is the problem of "Stealth" aircraft.

Nuclear Weapons Detection Test Termed Success

PM1207150089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Anichkin article under the rubric "From Authoritative Sources": "How To Find a Warhead"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a joint Soviet-American nongovernmental experiment was carried out in the Black Sea, in the region of the port of Yalta, on remote monitoring [distantsionnyy kontrol] of the presence of nuclear weapons on warships.

On behalf of the Navy, the missile cruiser "Slava," with a standard cruise missile with a nuclear warhead, the search and rescue ship "Apsheron," and a large landing ship with the appropriate technical means of verification took part in the experiment.

Soviet and American scientists calculated a long time ago the theoretical possibility of creating technical means of detecting nuclear weapons on board surface ships. Now this possibility has received experimental backing. According to Western estimates the USSR and the United States now have approximately 1,000 sea-based cruise missiles each. In the mid-nineties the

United States plans to deploy another 4,000 of these missiles, including 750 with nuclear warheads. Externally, the conventional missiles are indistinguishable from nuclear ones. Therefore the question of monitoring is very important for the treaty on strategic offensive arms that is in preparation.

However, scientists from the Washington scientific organization the Natural Resources Defense Council believe that the U.S. government has made no progress at all in this important sphere. The council and the USSR Academy of Sciences therefore put forward an initiative to institute a joint Soviet-American program to study the problem. And now the first experiment has been carried out. A.M. Mokerov, one of the scientific leaders of the international experiment and deputy chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences Program Research Center, told IZVESTIYA's correspondent about the results.

"The results obtained," he said, "are an important stage in the creation of a system that could be used to monitor whether there are nuclear weapons on surface ships. We installed mobile gamma spectrometers—Soviet and American—on the cruise missile launcher itself. With their help, we determined whether or not there was a nuclear warhead on the missile. Then the remote monitoring instruments—neutron and gamma spectrometer instruments—were tested. The neutron instruments were on a helicopter that overflew the cruiser, and the gamma spectrometers on a truck that was on the shore. The results of the tests are good, we could state clearly: Yes, the nuclear weapons were detected. This is the first step, and it proved successful."

[Anichkin] "If the experiment off the Crimean coast was the first stage, what comes next?"

[Mokerov] "We have already drawn up a schedule for more joint experiments. The preliminary plan is to hold them in May-July 1990 in the Mediterranean. We and our American colleagues have also agreed to exchange outlines for a comprehensive, effective verification system this year. The problem is that the missile itself is not visible on the ship—it is packed in the launcher container. Furthermore, universal launchers are being installed on new American ships, and these can be equipped with cruise, air defense, and antisubmarine missiles. The technical verification system must be able to determine precisely what is installed on a given ship at a given moment. Our outline provides for the creation of a remote and contact monitoring system. This could consist of several stages. If remote instruments initially register 'something nuclear' on a ship, then the contact equipment would be used, possibly involving the landing of inspectors on the ship."

Martin Zuker [as transliterated], a nuclear physicist from the Brookhaven national laboratory, was invited to the tests as an expert, by the Natural Resources Defense Council. Although his laboratory's work is secret and is financed by the U.S. Government, Doctor Zuker received permission to visit the USSR. This, he said, indicates that the U.S. government is, after all, interested in the results of the joint experiment, although it did not officially support it. Incidentally, a group of American congressmen were in Yalta with the scientists.

Martin Zuker agrees with the Soviet scientists that the experiment's success requires confirmation in further tests. Can a similar method be applied to American ships, or will some other method be used in that instance?

[Zuker] It is certainly possible, there are no obstacles to it, apart from the need to obtain agreement in principle from the American naval command. Incidentally, I would like to note that the Soviet military men and diplomats who helped with this experiment were extremely cordial and attentive. We value this highly and we hope that the example of openness set by the Soviet Navy will influence the American Government."

But by all appearances the American scientists' hopes will not be justified. The day after the experiment off the Crimean coast, U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher stated that the results obtained do not offer a reliable method of monitoring sea-based cruise missiles.

Usefulness of Experiment Viewed

18070683 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Jul 89 p 3

[Article by A. Zaytsev, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA special correspondent, the Black Sea: "The Nuclear Genie Capitulates"]

[Text] ...The admiral's barge approached the cruiser under the welcoming sounds of the traditional "ceremonial pipe" which greets high-ranking guests in the Navy. Along the deck, members of the "Slava" stood in an honorary formation, and, it seemed, that the weather itself, which changed from gloomy to a truly Black Sea sunny, catered to the ceremony of the moment.

Climbing the ladder together with his countrymen, the president of the Federation of American Scientists, the world-renowned physicist Professor Frank Von Hippel was noticeably moved. It was not many years ago that he told me that each of them would have relegated the possibility of showing up on a Soviet missile cruiser to an area of the most unbridled fantasies. To set foot here means to stand at the forward edge of our strategic defense. For decades the United States and the USSR guarded the holy of holies, their nuclear missile forces, from foreign eyes, competing in the accumulation of power at their pole of global military confrontation, even a small portion of which is capable of "boiling the oceans" and melting the continents, and, in a single breath, burning all of the world's oxygen.

It seemed that nothing would stop the endless race and nothing would make it possible to break out of the

vicious circle of competition, whose hostages both powers became, and with them, the entire world. A ray of hope was signalled in 1987 with the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

Representatives of both countries are struggling in Geneva for the second year on a mutually acceptable formula for reductions. Alas, their efforts have not yet brought results. The negotiations have run into a snag on sea-based nuclear cruise missiles. The United States persistently resists their inclusion within the scope of the negotiations, referring to the impossibility of controlling these types of weapons. Representatives of the American administration categorically reject direct onboard inspection, and they are convinced that effective technical means of monitoring do not exist.

Meanwhile, both the Soviet and American scientists have access to instruments that could be used for the detection of nuclear charges on ships. In our country, in particular, they are created in the Earth Physics Institute and the Institute of Geochemistry and Analytical Chemistry of the USSR AN [Academy of Sciences]. A part of the apparatuses and methodology were applied successfully in decontamination operations after the Chernobyl accident. In contacts with scientists, who are concerned about eliminating the nuclear threat and who are guided by the noble aim of eliminating the main obstacle in the Geneva negotiations, the idea was born to jointly test already available means under real conditions. Thus arose the American-Soviet experiment to monitor the presence or absence of nuclear weapons on board a surface ship. Its organizers were the USSR Academy of Sciences and the American Council for the Protection of Natural Resources.

The experiment is not governmental, and it was conducted on the American side as if by the personal initiative of the participants. The day before, U.S. officials came out against it, saying that the U.S. Navy does not want to set a precedent. Truly an eloquent admission that gives one away. What can be compared to the unprecedented openness and readiness for disarmament which is expressed in allowing specialists on a Soviet missile carrier, if not this? The unprecedented nature of such a step cannot help but attract universal attention. That is why, despite the attempt of U.S. authorities to ignore the experiment, three members of the U.S. Congress and a large group of American and other foreign journalists were climbing the ladder to board the "Slava."

After a warm meeting an a tour of the ship, the experiment participants and representivatives of the public and the press gathered at the bow of the ship. Here, at one of the 16 launchers, armed with a cruise missile with a no less real nuclear warhead, it was fated that an event should occur which in a full sense had a breakthrough significance: establishment of the possibility of creating means of detection of naval nuclear weapons whose danger is growing from day to day.

A Soviet gamma spectrometer is affixed to the body of the installation. In exactly 10 minutes, in accordance with the program of the experiment, impulses coming from inside are recorded. Afterwards, Thomas (Cochran), head of the American group, and his colleagues Steve Fetter, Marty (Zucher) and Lee (Grodzins) climb onto the installation with their apparatuses. During the same period of time, they record a stream of gamma rays with a force of 300 impulses per second. One can already conclude that the inside of the installation contains the radioactive materials Uranium-235, Uranium-232, and Plutonium-239.

At the request of the Americans, they are permitted to measure the gamma stream in the adjacent installation. The intensity is only 20 impulses per second—which means it is empty. The level of radiation from the deck of the ship that they measured was just as low, which characterized the overall radiation background.

KA-27 helicopters fly over the missile carrier, with remote sensors aimed at the installation. The search and rescue vessel "Apsheron" passes alongside, equipped with apparatuses for processing obtained data. And that is the culmination of the experiment. The participants and the observers of the experiment are invited to the forecastle where, at the command "open container covers" they see the rapacious beak of the missile come up from the bowels of the installation and point toward the sky. This is visible confirmation of the reliability of the data received during the course of the experiment.

Of course, the experiment did not resolve all problems associated with the verification of nuclear weapons based at sea, which in itself is very difficult. However, it showed that the development of such verification is possible in principle. And this conclusion of the scientists puts those in a difficult position who agree in words with the idea of maximum nuclear weapons reductions, but who in deed place all kinds of obstacles on the road to accomplishing this.

Both the American and Soviet scientists were unanimous in the conclusion that it was necessary to continue perfecting the technical means of verification right up to achieving a capability to establish not only the presence of nuclear cruise missiles on ships, but also the number of warheads on them.

"The experiment was more than useful," said John Spratt, head of the delegation of the U.S. Congress and member of the House of Representatives, after the completion of the experiment. "Nonetheless, this is only the first step on a long road to the development of an effective system of verifying sea-based nuclear cruise missiles, with which the American and Soviet sides will be able to trust each other completely.

Disarmament Procedures With U.S. Discussed
LD1807102389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1423 GMT 15 Jul 89

[From the "Planeta" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] One of the new realities of the modern world lies in the expanding cooperation among diplomats, scientists, and the public in a drive to secure universal security. In our times it has become obvious that a policy can only be realistic and effective when it is based on science and when it is sensitive to the feelings of people. Science gives a policy precise knowledge, and public opinion gives the common sense whose shortage is at times so keenly felt in mutual relations between states. About 100 experts of world status from more than 25 countries—socialist, developing, and capitalist—gathered at the UN regional disarmament conference held in Dagomyk. [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Video shows shots of the conference in session, meetings with journalists; unidentified correspondent speaks]

[Correspondent] Implementation of the INF treaty is currently under way. An important role in this is played by the two centers for reducing nuclear danger: one in Moscow, the other in Washington. They were set up by separate agreement in 1987. Their original aim was modest: to inform one another of ballistic missile launchings beyond the national territories. But now they are fully responsible for implementation of the treaty.

[Major-General V.I. Medvedev, head of the USSR National Center for Reducing Nuclear Danger] The results can best be summed up with figures. To date the Soviet Union has already eliminated 945 missiles. That is 51 percent of the amount that it is bound to eliminate under the treaty. The U.S. side has eliminated 311 missiles. That is approximately 37 percent of their overall quantity. Of the missiles which had previously caused most public concern, that is, the RSD-10 [SS-20] missiles on our side, and the Pershing-2 missiles on the U.S. side, the correlation of figures is as follows: we have eliminated 192 RSD-10 missiles, that is approximately 30 percent of the total quantity; the U.S. side has eliminated 27 Pershing-2 missiles, approximately 11 percent of their sum total.

Well, as head of the center, I would like to say here that we would like to see a faster pace in eliminating the Pershing-2's. It can be added that in the last year the Soviet Union has totally eliminated such a category of missiles as ground-launched cruise missiles. The launchers for the OTR-22 [SS-12] missiles have been totally eliminated to date, the elimination of the missiles themselves of this type is nearing completion. On the U.S. side elimination of the Pershing-1A missiles is nearing completion, that is a shorter-range missile. That is, elimination is in full swing. Our work this year has confirmed that the unique verification system provided for by the treaty has proved fully effective and viable. The treaty is being implemented, and the fact that it is being implemented in full measure has been noted on more than one occasion by both sides, both the U.S. and the Soviet, and the course of the inspections confirms this conclusion.

[Correspondent] [passage omitted] What is the main condition for achieving an agreement on halving strategic weapons? First and foremost, compliance with the ABM treaty concluded between the USSR and the United States in 1977. I remind you that under this treaty the creation of more than two launching complexes for ABM interceptors is prohibited, and an ABM interceptor is a missile designed to intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles or their components in the flight trajectory before they hit their targets. This system also includes radar stations. Moreover, the treaty, and this is very important, obligates its participants not to develop, not to test, and not to deploy sea-based, mobile land- based or air- and space-based systems. In December 1987, following the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the joint statement spoke of an obligation to comply with the ABM treaty for at least a definite period, in the form in which it was signed. So far, instead of this, the United States has been working in the direction of a revision of the treaty, continuing to work out plans for the so- called strategic defence initiative, or SDI, in other words the deployment of a weapons systems in outer space. [end recording]

[Video shows archive clips of missiles and other weapons systems, and of U.S. President Bush]

[Announcer, providing translation of Bush remarks] In order to advance the talks on strategic arms limitation we are under no obligation to forego our view on the strategic defence initiative. The United States is fully resolved to deploy [razvernut] it.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Sergey Rybin, identified by caption] Why is the U.S. delegation at the talks on nuclear and space armaments insisting on moving over from observance of the ABM treaty to a situation in which reliance would be placed on strategic defense?

[V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister, identified by caption] Well, I think that all of this is due to the statement made by President Reagan in March, 1983. In that statement he set the task of creating [sozdaniye] a wide-scale anti-missile defense system. Since then, in fact, the U.S. Administration has made it its purpose to gradually roll up the operation of the ABM treaty and replace it with a new agreement that would essentially permit experiments for the creation of the SDI and for its further development [razvertyvaniye]. We consider that this approach does not correspond to the tasks of strengthening strategic stability between the USSR and the United States in so far as the creation of a wide-scale ABM system would lead to destabilization of the stable equilibrium which I would say has come into being

between the strategic arsenals of the USSR and the United States. The question of reducing these arsenals, therefore, can only proceed if the ABM treaty is preserved in full measure as it was signed in 1972. Herein lies the essence of the problem.

[Rybin] What, then, is strategic stability?

[Karpov] Strategic stability is a correlation of forces between the USSR and the United States in the field of strategic arsenals, in which neither side can count upon being able to deliver a disarming first strike, that is to say a correlation of forces of a kind in which the side which is subjected to attack will without fail have the ability to deliver a retaliatory, destructive strike will become pointless.

[Unidentified correspondent] The elementary logic of arms reductions is that limitations on offensive and defensive systems are inseparably linked, for with present levels of techology a defensive potential can easily be turned into an offensive one. During the first years when talks on limiting strategic armaments began, at the beginning of the 1970's, the Americans defended this principle resolutely; after all, that was the principle that led to the conclusion of the ABM treaty, and one would think that our concern today over the plans for creating SDI ought to be understandable to the Americans. But, as you see, such understanding does not exist yet. And there are also three other issues at the strategic offensive arms talks on which agreement has not been reached.

[Karpov] The first one is the need to limit sea-based cruise missiles; the second issue is the working out of a procedure for counting air-based cruise missiles; and the third one is that of verification.

[Barry Daniel, U.S. participant in the nuclear and space arms negotiations in Geneva, identified by caption, in English with superimposed Russian translation]. We must be realists. Not all verification means are acceptable for the sides. And we must understand and recognize that the solution of the verification methods question is nothing other than one of exchange: you propose something, you concede something, and you hope to get something in exchange. The question is the extent to which this exchange is justified. A treaty on strategic offensive weapons will require more extensive verification procedures—that category of armaments is more complex. Another key point is the ability of the treaty to withstand being done through in detail and over a long period of time—I would even say picked over—in the Senate prior to ratification. Senators hold an extremely wide range of views concerning the adoption of a good and verifiable agreement in the interests of the United States. I do not want to exaggerate the importance of this either for the potential success or failure of the agreement. But the SALT-2 treaty, for example, will never be ratified for precisely this reason. The (?objectives) of the talks were to no purpose. [video shows Daniel addressing meeting from his place at a table]

[Unidentified correspondent] And so the White House is once more bringing the verification problem into the foreground, a problem on which they have stumbled more than once in the past. Of course, it is not a matter of its being unsolvable, but of the way in which it is dealt with. What lies behind it?

[Karpov] On verification and United States is going backwards, at any rate as far as one can judge from the positions that it has been taking at the end of the previous round of talks, that is to say in October and November of last year. The United States has put forward new proposals which are much narrower in what they cover than what is being discussed earlier. Essentially the United States in these new proposals on verification is trying to equate verification with the verification of mobile ground-based missiles, that is to say of those armaments that the Soviet Union has and that the United States does not have, thereby monitoring us but removing the problem of monitoring U.S. territory. We are in favor of verification being full, but equal and fair: that is to say it must be verification of U.S. enterprises and installations to the same extent that it is of Soviet ones.

[Rybin] Viktor Pavlovich, you are an experienced diplomat. Your role is well-known in the Geneva talks which led to the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. I have the following question for you about the philosophy of the talks, the fact that until recently the tactics at the talks, the approach to the talks, amounted to one of demanding more than you want, because it makes no difference as you'll always get less. What are the tactics of our diplomats at the talks today?

[Karpov] Unfortunately, you know, those tactics perhaps still remain in the Soviet-U.S. talks: they remain if only because we see from the positions that are put to us by the U.S. side that that is a maximum position, a position which envisages that a desire to encroach upon the interests of the Soviet Union can be seen on certain issues. For our own part we do not set ourselves that kind of task at the talks, of speaking from positions which would be to the detriment of the United States. Our positions, therefore, are much closer to reality than are the positions from which the other side is now conducting the talks.

[Rybin] You know my personal impression, Viktor Pavlovich, is that the Americans are conducting talks with us with an emphasis on the sporting aspects, so to speak; when they say again the ball is in your court, you think it's a game of tennis.

[Karpov] That is the press, you know, which is accustomed to providing figurative assessments. The Americans love this kind of thing, they love sport and they love sporting terminology. But I do not think we can be guided by sporting concepts of that kind: who's passing the ball to whom, or who's taking the ball from whom. I think that the time has come on the basis of the new thinking to look here into the question of whether or not

it is worth sitting down at the table and saying where do our common interests lie? What do they amount to?

Let's define these common interests. Clearly they amount to creating at lower levels of strategic armaments a system of security for both sides, not at the expense of the security of the other side, but precisely in the interests of the security of both sides. From that point of view it seems to me that the possibility is there for speeding up the talks process for not engaging in deals of the kind we'll concede to you here and you concede to us there, for defining indeed the most rational approaches and for being guided by these at the talks when the specific provisions of the document are are being drawn up.

[Daniel] The lessons of the INF treaty and the past 40 years show that we must continue the policy of peace through strength if we want a real improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations. The firm position of the West has proved its success. The United States' nuclear policy is also at work. The strategy of deterrence has proved that it is a buffer in the protection of peace and stability. And that means that we have to look boldly at several unpleasant things. First, we need nuclear weapons for deterrence in the foreseeable future; these weapons play a key role, only they can stop a potential enemy from yielding to the temptation of delivering the first strike. Second, we cannot build defense by placing our hopes only in arms control, although the Soviet calls sound extremely tempting. But good sense in politics does not consist in accepting calls as though they were achievements. The basic strategy of the West of being firm under pressure has achieved success. [video shows Daniel addressing meeting]

[Unidentified correspondent] That is the U.S. position. The talks on reducing strategic offensive weapons are difficult. The heaps of mistrust and suspicion that have built up over decades have to be cleared away. We have been describing the main approaches held by the sides. As you see, there are differences and they are substantial ones. There can only be one conclusion, and this was stressed by all those taking part in the meeting in Dagomys with whom I spoke: only commonsense and realistic approach can bring success. More than 4 decades ago the first mushroom-shaped cloud from an atomic explosion rose into the air at the U.S. nuclear proving ground in a New Mexico desert. Since then mankind has lived in the nuclear era in large measures thanks to good fortune. This does not give any grounds for complacency. What happened in the New Mexico desert cannot be turned back. But, if we want to survive, we can resort to sound wisdom and rid ourselves of the prospect of a nuclear apocalypse. We can do so, and we must. There is no alternative. [end recording]

Readers Comment on Missile Destruction

52000062 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Apr 89 p 2

[Excerpts from readers' letters and commentary: "Today Begins Tomorrow"; for the text of the interview with O. Mamalyga referred to in the introduction, see the 27 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 8-11]

[Text] **Formally we workers of enterprises of the former Ministry of Light and the Food Industry, came under the aegis of the "defense industry" just a few days ago. Actually, even before this a certain party of our output was oriented toward special (read: defense) products. So the discussion conducted by the newspaper on problems of conversion misplaces us twice over. The wall mentioned by O. Mamalyga ("Economics of Disarmament," SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 13 April of this year) runs not by us but through us. This is probably why we are especially sensitive to cases of destruction of colossal material values in connection with the INF Treaty. These values were created through the incredible efforts of generations of Soviet people, their sweat and blood, prolonged self-discipline, and billions and billions taken from our pockets!**

Of course to eliminate war and save civilization is a lofty and noble goal. But why destroy material values.... No, we cannot reconcile ourselves to this approach. Because the great scientific-technical and material potential created in the defense branches can and should serve the national good not tomorrow but today.

Even yesterday one could not dream of using the technology of some secret shop or section for the manufacture of regular products. But now specialists from the defense complex have visited us. Proposals were generated and they have been realized. Here is just one example.

We have traditionally used thin-walled pipes for manufacturing the working parts of the carding machine for processing flax and wool. The turner was the main figure here. From these parts alone 210 tons of metal went to shavings. And there were not enough turners and the metal wrong and the quality was not quite good enough. Recently we have been using rotation drawing which previously was far beyond our reach. Productivity increased by a factor of 5-6. The coefficient of the utilization of metal increased to 0.85. What was previously unattainable quality of the component became a reality. Thirty highly skilled turners are being released.

Is that good? Yes. But still.... I still will not say that we are experiencing deep satisfaction.

A couple of days ago the figures were made public: By the end of the year 40 percent of the military production should be changed over to civilian. Naturally, I cannot give the specific figure for our association. But the volume of defense industry products is decreasing, and significantly. And this means that the materials, components, and batching items that were ordered at one time will become so-called nonliquid assets. I repeat other SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA authors: Their value is very great.

Among the batching items, for example, that will become nonliquid assets, for example, are valves. Probably millions of these simple components are used in national economic output. But they are qualitatively different items. For example, the valves for agricultural irrigation

equipment do not last very long since they are made of far from the best grades of metal. But our valves, when they are used in frigates or other similar equipment, will last for years or perhaps decades. Do we have a right to expatiate on any real advantage of we do not use them for their intended purposes?

The list of our nonliquid assets includes both the latest items and those created years ago. But both are guarded by conditions of the strictest secrecy. It would seem that the first step in normalizing and streamlining the process of conversion should be a legislative act from the highest state organ of authority which would establish the specific period of a ban on the outflow of parts, components, materials, and technologies from the defense industry into the peacetime branches. I emphasize: We need a mandatory law which is the same for all ministries and departments, for all of today's "pyramid" of the defense industry.

When will such an act appear? Time will not stand still: The destruction of the resources is not far in the future. And we are certainly not speaking about Tekhmash alone: Our association is only a speck of dust in comparison to the giants of the defense complex. So we can only guess at the amounts of the forthcoming losses. So before adopting a law on the transfer, apparently, it is necessary to have some kind of decree or instructions from the USSR Council of Ministers concerning conducting in the branches competitions of proposals for the utilization of technologies, materials, and components. Discussions of problems of conversion must be put on a practical basis. And competitions will be a realistic mechanism for counteracting the destruction of property that has accumulated in the warehouses.

It is far from easy to break down what has been formed over decades by the administrative management system. And it must be broken down not by command methods (although it is impossible to do without regulating legal acts) but by economic ones. And the most important of them is placing the entire budget both of the Army and of the industry that supports it under the public control of officials elected by the people. Let the military request funds based on the doctrine of adequate defense. And the people's deputies at the congresses, after careful and open analysis of the appetites of the military department, decide the quantity of funds to allot and for which items. Then we shall not have this senseless freezing of resources that could effectively serve for our well-being.
[Signed] V. Zhestkov, general director of the Tekhmash PO [Production Association], Orel

Lines From Letters

In my opinion, the designer O. Mamalyga has changed the problem of conversion into an aspect of public opinion. With our generally recognized poverty and inefficiency we are still destroying the final results of production—the commodity! Indeed, what nonsense!

I completely and fully support the idea of "economic disarmament" for its practical significance and purposefulness.
[Signed] V. Samodin, Moscow Oblast

Why not use the destroyed missiles for peaceful (world) purposes? Why not create a space station under the aegis of the United Nations? We could count how many launches could be made from one of our units and one American one and leave a corresponding number of missiles intact. And then at the request of any of the UN member nations we could launch them for peaceful purposes. Perhaps even free of charge. And we could organize a competition of scientific programs! In this case the missiles would still be destroyed but it would be for the good of mankind.

I fully support O. Mamalyga's proposals. I myself served in Kapustin Yar during the seventies. I know what missiles are. I think we must take an economical approach to writing off military equipment. Why not use the missiles for launching communications satellites? This would significantly expand and improve telephone communications in the country as well as the number of radio and television channels. For unlike European countries, which have satellite television throughout Europe, we have nothing of the kind.
[Signed] V. Shcherbak, Krasnodar Kray

Like all Soviet people, I welcomed the INF Treaty. But when I saw on television how they are destroying the missiles with explosions I was so upset: Such a barbarian way of destroying public (albeit military) property! Do we really not have the intelligence to use the complete missiles systems that are being eliminated for the needs of the national economy?

Esteemed editors, ask the responsible officials to respond on the pages of your newspaper (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA is also my newspaper; I have subscribed to it since the first issue) to the questions raised by O. Mamalyga.
[Signed] G. Makarin, Belgorod

Our Commentary

As the mail shows, the conversation with the military equipment designer Oleg Ivanovich Mamalyga interested the readers a great deal. Alas, among the responses there were no answers from ministries and departments involved in the problem. Neither from defense nor civilian departments. We asked USSR Minister of Defense D. Yazov personally to grant the newspaper an interview concerning problems of conversion and disarmament. For you cannot get away from problems in this way which is not very popular in a time of glasnost. And, judging from the forthcoming disarmament, the Army has many problems. And the Army can hardly conquer them by itself. Or does the comrade minister think differently?
[Signed] I. Klimenko, newspaper's editor for the department of machine building and new technology.

Karpov Stresses Cuts in Foreign Troop Presence
LD2007203989 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—France seeks to broaden and extend knowledge about the current changes in the USSR, Jean Lecanuet, head of a delegation of the French Senate commission on external relations, defense and armed forces, said today at a meeting in the USSR Supreme Soviet. The delegation, which arrived in Moscow on Wednesday [19 July] at the invitation of the committees on world affairs as well as defense and state security, was received by their leadership and members. "Perestroika is our main interest," Jean Lecanuet said.

Aleksandr Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the committee on world affairs, told about the pace of political reform in the Soviet Union and cited as examples the latest elections to the supreme body of state power, the work of the Congress of People's Deputies and the current session of the Supreme Soviet.

The delegation visited today the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Deputy Minister Viktor Karpov briefed its members on Soviet evaluations of the state of affairs at the Vienna talks on conventional forces in Europe (CFE) and security and confidence-building measures. "The development of the Vienna negotiations is marked on the whole by dynamism and it is an encouraging fact that NATO countries, although not completely, made their proposals on the levels of reductions before September, which allows one to speak about the possible progress in the next few months," the Soviet diplomat said. He added that the rapprochement of the positions lays good groundwork for a search for solutions that will suit all participants. However, this does not mean that there no questions have been left to be discussed. [sentence as received]

The deputy Soviet minister described the problem of reduction of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO as one of the serious issues at the negotiations. "We have not met understanding from NATO." he noted. "The point at issue is reducing U.S. and Soviet troops deployed on the territory of foreign states. At the same time, speaking about the reduction of such troops, because soldiers of other countries are also stationed on FRG territory. [sentence as received] As for the Warsaw Treaty, there are no other Warsaw Treaty troops on foreign territory except for the Soviet forces."

Viktor Karpov drew attention to questions of reducing air forces. "We believe that NATO countries displayed realism by agreeing to include aviation among the armaments due to be reduced. But weapons which can be used for offensive purposes should be cut in the first place." In this connection he dismissed as "absolutely groundless" the inclusion in the number of planes subject for reduction the interceptor planes of the air defense forces.

Dwelling on verification issues, the deputy minister stated the Soviet readiness to tackle them in the most radical manner. The Soviet Union is ready for a comprehensive verification system to ensure complete compliance with the obligations, he stressed.

Issues of developing relations between the USSR and the European community, prospects for developing bilateral political dialogue in the light of the results of the recent Soviet-French summit meeting were also discussed at the meeting.

Korionov Praises East-West Military Cooperation
PM2007100589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Viewpoint": "Paths Toward Trust"]

[Text] One of the pet arguments of the enemies of Soviet-U.S. cooperation is to claim that the methods and means of verification are not effective enough. And, in my view, tribute should be paid to those circles in the United States, primarily the scientific community, which have been making efforts to show that such claims are groundless.

I recall that cooperation between Soviet scientists and representatives of U.S. scientific circles helped to dispel the myth that there are no effective means of verifying underground nuclear explosions. Then the proponents of nuclear weapons began claiming that there are no reliable means of ensuring the remote verification of the presence of such weapons on board warships.

At one time the USSR proposed to the United States a government experiment in the verification of sea-based nuclear weapons. That proposal did not find support in Washington. Then the scientists set to work again. The USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council agreed to pool their efforts and hold such an experiment. Tests were conducted off the port of Yalta aboard the guided missile cruiser "Slava," and they proved successful: Both the Soviet and the U.S. equipment registered the presence of a nuclear charge on board.

Everyone will remember how the Pentagon, trying to justify the implementation of the "Star Wars" program, tried to scare the Americans by writing in its journal SOVIET MILITARY POWER that prototypes and examples of a laser weapon are being created and tested at secret Soviet defense installations. So recently the USSR Defense Ministry invited a group of U.S. Congressmen and scientists to visit two such installations—a plant belonging to the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry in the Urals, and the Saryshagan test site in North Kazakhstan. What happened? At the Urals plant the visitors saw for themselves that the shutting down of two reactors and the preparations to shut down a third have resulted in the reduction of plutonium production. Representative J. Olin, former vice president of General Electric, stated that he had

come to the conclusion that "this is not the weapon that people are saying can destroy a satellite." Thus the reality is affirmed.

At the same time our Pacific Fleet command, seeking to broaden mutual trust, invited military observers from the United States, Japan, and a number of other countries as well as foreign journalists to watch tactical exercises by the fleet's forces. Journalists from Britain, the PRC, Thailand, and some other countries accepted the invitation, although for some reason U.S. and Japanese military observers did not attend the exercise. Perhaps they are afraid of setting a precedent?....

Nevertheless, we are witnessing a phenomenon of great political significance: The expansion of contacts between the military leaders and armed forces of socialist and capitalist countries.

What we have here is a whole series of Soviet-U.S. contacts on a military level. The two countries' defense ministers met first in Bern and then in Moscow. An authoritative delegation from the USSR Defense Ministry has visited the United States. Recently Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, visited the Soviet Union.

The creation of a structure for mutual relations in the military sphere is not confined to the Soviet Union and the United States. During M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France there were talks between Soviet and French military leaders resulting in the signing of a 2-year agreement on military contacts between the USSR and France. I would also recall here that Admiral D. Wellershoff, general inspector of the Bundeswehr, visited the USSR in the spring, after which a group of officers and men from the Moscow Military District toured the FRG.

Thus, a new "front" is open. One of peace. A front of dialogue and contacts in another important direction.

NATO's Woerner Security Seminar Speech Criticized

PM2007092589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin "Rejoinder": "Pluralism According to Woerner"]

[Text] There can be no question that the decline of tension between the world's two military poles and the almost universally held opinion that the "cold war" is over are the consequences of Soviet restructuring. There is also tangible evidence of its real effect on sentiments in favor of restraining efforts in the military sphere and retargeting intellectual potential toward the sphere of construction. This effect, however, is stubbornly opposed in the West by the champions of hardline traditions in military policy. They cultivate by all possible means mistrust of the Soviet Union's policy, claiming that cutbacks in arms appropriations threaten to undermine the West's overall strategy and weaken its positions in the face of the "threat from the East" that allegedly remains. They say: It is of paramount importance to ensure that military departments continue to improve the technical base, as well as to step up the gathering of intelligence data in order to ensure readiness for any surprises.

The best way to awaken fears about security among the broad public is to talk feelingly of "surprises." Which, in general, is what is being done. A graphic example of this can be seen in a recent speech by NATO Secretary General M. Woerner at a seminar on questions of European security organized by the Adenauer Foundation.

Describing the present stage of historical development, Woerner recalled the two-faced Roman god Janus: On the one hand, chances have emerged to achieve stability and to consolidate freedom and democracy but, on the other hand, an era of great changes and great uncertainty is inevitably associated with risk and danger. Moreover, whereas NATO—according to Woerner—provides "the basis for stability and prevention of war," the communist countries are the source of unpredictability and all worries as they cling to "the postulates of their ideology" and refuse to accept Western values as the only acceptable ones.

"The time has come to free political debate from its orientation toward weapons, strategy, and disarmament and to turn it in the direction of the key problems of changing Europe's political complexion," Woerner exclaims, hinting that "the peaceful European order" must be built exclusively according to capitalist technology and that this is the only way confrontation will diminish. Let us note that by no means all of Europe thinks in such an orthodox fashion. Where lies the threat to Europeans' security—in the mountains of arms or the existence of two social systems in the continent? This is a question that people today answer differently according to their beliefs. Cause and effect are most closely intertwined here, and there is a something scholastic about attempting to draw a straight demarcation line between them. Now it is probably not worth plunging into a debate on what is primary and what is secondary in this issue, because this might create artificial obstacles across the path to mutual understanding.

While summoning us to openness and pluralism and at the same time elevating his own vision of world order to the status of an absolute, Mr Woerner essentially advocates a pluralism under which the West alone would enjoy the freedom to express ideological views. But this would prevent military-political thinking from being brought into line with the new conditions.

At this point it is appropriate to recall the stance taken in this regard by the Warsaw Pact states, as expressed in the Political Consultative Committee statement on the results of the 7-8 July conference. It says in particular: "Differences between individual states or groups of

states must not obstruct mutual understanding and collaboration. On the contrary, the diversity of European peoples' experiences could become a source of mutual enrichment."

Foreign Ministry's Reshetov Discusses Emigration

18070680 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 27, 8-14 Jul 89 pp 6-7

[Interview with Yu. Reshetov, chief of the Administration for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, USSR MFA, by Yu. Sigov, AiF correspondent, under the rubric "An Actual Interview": "Will Departure Be Free?"]

[Text] **After the publication of the article "Departure" (AiF, 1989, No 12), the editorial office received numerous letters from readers which contain a request to return to a discussion of this subject. Our correspondent is told by Yu. Reshetov, chief of the Administration of the USSR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] on International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, how the Soviet Union today implements the provisions of the Vienna Agreements associated with the simplification of procedures for exit from and entry into the country.**

[Sigov] At the beginning of March of this year the MFA, with the participation of other interested organizations, prepared a draft of new USSR legislation on entry and exit. However, it has still not been adopted. What is the reason?

[Reshetov] The delay in the adoption of the legislative act on entry and exit is connected with the fact that, now, after the first Congress of People's Deputies, this falls within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet. Of course, it will have to decide numerous complicated problems, but, in my view, speedy adoption specifically of the Law on Entry and Exit is of paramount significance. With it we will not only demonstrate to our own people the practical realization of the ideas of restructuring, but we will also raise the international prestige of the USSR. In particular, discussions are going on in the United States about the possibility of cancelling discriminatory measures in the area of trade with our country, specifically in connection with a change in Soviet emigration legislation.

I want to appeal to the deputies of the Supreme Soviet that they not only begin discussions on this bill, but that they also consider the opinions of experts and specialists in this area who are participating in its development.

[Sigov] Apart from the new Law on Entry into and Exit from the USSR, a bill is being prepared on the freedom of conscience. One of its main provisions is the introduction of alternative civilian duties as a replacement for military service....

[Reshetov] Similar service should be stipulated, in my opinion, for people who, because of their religious convictions, cannot perform military service. As far back as 14 December 1920, V.I. Lenin signed such a decree which existed until the beginning of the 1940's. At that time, a special expert commission was established which, convinced of the impossibility of a believer to serve in the army for religious reasons, assigned him to perform alternative service, for example, as a medical aid in hospitals with patients suffering from contagious diseases. Incidentally, alternative civilian service exists in virtually all Western countries, and also in Hungary, the GDR, and Poland, and the period of service is longer than military service.

[Sigov] What specific changes are provided in the new legislation on entry and exit?

[Reshetov] First of all, there is a provision to cancel the collection of 500 rubles from Soviet citizens who are departing for permanent residence in Israel, and also a discontinuance of the effect of the ukase of 1967 concerning deprivation of Soviet citizenship on departure for Israel.

An important point of the new law will be the resolution of the question about the departure abroad of citizens of the USSR in the event that their relatives who remain in the Soviet Union disagree with this. As is known, relatives in our country are responsible for the support of other members of the family. However, in many cases this practice comes into conflict with real life. If relatives have lost family ties long ago and are purely nominal as such (for example, one of the divorced spouses does not agree to let his own child go abroad, although he has not taken part in the child's upbringing for a long time), then the party departing from the USSR has a right to appeal to the court. He will satisfy similar claims within the scope of alimony obligations that are stipulated in our legislation with great specificity.

[Sigov] And when will invitations for departure to go abroad be revoked?

[Reshetov] As for an invitation, it is also still necessary for departure from the USSR for temporary and permanent residence abroad. The invitation is itself a guarantee of financial security and support of a person who ends up in a foreign country. According to the new legislation, an invitation for the temporary stay of a Soviet citizen abroad will not be necessary at all. If it is a question about departure abroad for permanent living, then for this a citizen of the USSR must have an invitation from any person who lives permanently in the given foreign country.

[Sigov] And how will the new legislation resolve the question about the cancellation of registration, which was introduced in our country in 1932 and which, incidentally, no other country in the world has anymore?

[Reshetov] The problem of revoking registration as a method of bureaucratic "attachment" of Soviet citizens to a place of residence will be decided, apparently, in the

context of the law on the freedom of movement on the territory of the USSR. It should be realized that the laws of many foreign states provide their own measures for the "attachment" of people to specific residences. Thus, the citizens of Switzerland are prohibited from changing their place of residence without special notification of the Ministry of Defense (universal military service exists in the country both for men and women). In our country, the registration system is justified by references to economic considerations (housing, work). However, resolution of these problems, as is done in an overwhelming majority of countries, is possible without the bureaucratic "attachment" of people to a place of residence.

[Sigov] Besides the "registration" attachment of people to a place of residence, there is also the artifical "closing" of many regions of the country not only to foreigners, but to our own citizens....

[Reshetov] Recently, the number of "closed" areas in our country was reduced significantly. This work will be continued in the future also, inasmuch as artificial "fencing in" of part of the territory of the Soviet Union not only arouses the legal ire of our citizens, but it also undermines the international prestige of the country. Because in many states of the world, areas "closed" for visiting by Soviet people were established in response to the appearance of such areas originally in the USSR.

[Sigov] Cases arose in the past when a person desiring to go abroad was said to be not responsible for his actions and was placed in a psychiatric hospital. Is it possible now in such a situation to demand international experts for the purpose of establishing the presence of an illness?

[Reshetov] First of all, I will mention that the Soviet Union is among those countries of the world (and they are a minority) in which the need to put a person into forced treatment in a psychiatric hospital is first and foremost a right of doctors. In the first years of Soviet authority, another procedure existed which is in effect today in a majority of states, where a judge is obligated to take part in certification. Thus, a decision on the degree of diminished responsibility of a patient was made on a legal basis.

Under current conditions, the conduct of international medical examinations by experts is quite possible. Not long ago our country was visited by a group of American psychiatrists which which spent some time in hospitals and examined patients who were considered by Soviet doctors to be of diminished responsibility. I believe that similar measures of verification in this sphere must be developed.

[Sigov] It is known that in the stagnation years many prominent representatives of our science and culture were forced to leave the USSR and were deprived of Soviet citizenship. How will questions be resolved that concern the restoration of their civil rights under current conditions?

[Reshetov] Today, about 200,000 Soviet citizens live abroad permanently. As for these people, those who were groundlessly deprived of Soviet citizenship, if they have not engaged in anti-Soviet activity (and criticism of customs existing in the USSR is not held to be such), then in the event that they make a request to our competent organs to restore them to Soviet citizenship, such requests will be resolved in a very short time.

U.S., Egypt Differ on UN Mideast Conference

PM1907142389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS reports: "Two Positions"]

[Text] Cairo, 17 Jul—An international conference under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of all the interested parties is the most acceptable road to peace in the Near East in the current conditions, Egyptian President Husni Mubarak has stated. Speaking to journalists at the end of his meetings and talks in France he noted that such a conference can ensure the most effective progress toward a peace settlement. Then, after the conference has been convened, the president said, it is possible that other steps will be needed.

Commenting on the results of Mubarak's visit to France, Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd-al-Majid, Egyptian deputy prime minister and minister of foreign affairs, said that in Paris Egypt had clearly and precisely expounded its position on the amendments introduced by the Likud to the plan for holding elections in the occupied territories. In this form the plan is absolutely unacceptable to the Arabs. The Likud's decision is designed to torpedo the process of a peace settlement and ruin efforts to resolve the Palestinian problem—the key problem in the Near East, the minister stated.

Washington, 17 Jul—The position of the new U.S. Administration on the idea of calling an international conference on the Near East has not changed in any way whatsoever in relation to the policy of the Reagan administration, James Baker, U.S. secretary of state, has stated.

Speaking Sunday on an ABC-TV program he stressed that such a conference may prove "useful" only if it is "correctly constructed" and held at "the right time." The Bush administration, as has become apparent from his statements, does not support the call for such a representative forum at present.

According to Baker, the steps now being taken to call an international conference on the Near East may stop "other, more promising possibilities" from being realized. By such possibilities the U.S. secretary of state meant the plan put forward by Israeli Prime Minister Shamir to hold limited elections in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories, which has been rejected by the Arab countries and the PLO.

'Positive Trends' Seen in UNESCO Activity

PM2007083589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Commentary by V. Roschin: "Uniting the Spiritual Potential"]

[Text] UNESCO Director General Federico Mayor, a Spanish academic, public figure, and politician, has arrived in Moscow.

An active member of the Club of Rome, the Issyk-Kul Forum, and the International Foundation for Survival and Cooperation, he is head of the Secretariat of UNESCO, this international organization whose charter commits it to "instilling the idea of peace in people's consciousness" and developing mankind's intellectual and moral solidarity.

The unique feature of UNESCO is that it is essentially the only intergovernmental organization operating in the sphere of human intellect and ethics. It is often called the "thinking head," the "laboratory of ideas," and even the "conscience of the United Nations."

The election of F. Mayor as director general of UNESCO took place at a critical time for the organization. UNESCO was at the epicenter of difficulties that were typical at the time of the entire UN system. The United States, Britain, and also Singapore had quit UNESCO, which not only aggravated the situation in and around the organization, but led to a sharp cut in the budget and, consequently, in the potential for implemnting the program. It is no accident that with the appointment of F. Mayor to the top job in the UNESCO Secretariat many people hoped that the crisis phenomena would be overcome, cooperation strengthened, the operating mechanism improved, the organization's efficiency increased, and its versatility restored.

In conditions of the general improvement of the international situation there are signs of the dominance in UNESCO of positive trends, which must be consolidated and developed at the upcoming 25th session of the general conference in the fall. The UNESCO supreme forum, which now brings together 158 states and cooperates with 540 nongovernmental organizations, will examine program documents, including the plan for the next 6 years.

Our country has been participating in UNESCO's activity for 3 ½ decades now. Vigorous international cooperation is developing within the framework of major programs of oceanology, hydrology, geological correlation, information science, and communications development, the "Man and the Biosphere" program, social science, culture, and education. UNESCO responded sensitively and offered assistance in eliminating the aftermath of the Armenian earthquake and Leningrad library fire.

The USSR, which traditionally supports UNESCO, is a vigorous advocate of enhancing the organization's authority and role in the world and developing general humanitarian cooperation. UNESCO must make maximum use of the latest achievements of human thought, science, and technology, actively involve major intellects in its activity, and in every way confirm its unique mission in the solution of mankind's global problems.

In welcoming the UNESCO director general's visit to the USSR Soviet people hope that it will contribute to the further activation of our country's participation in the organization's affairs, the consolidation and augmentation of the world's spiritual and intellectual forces, and the elaboration of new approaches to problems of humanitarian and intellectual cooperation in the interests of peace and security.

Ovchinnikov Advocates 'Common Asian Process'

PM1107111489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
3 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov commentary: "Catalyst for a Common Asian Process"]

[Text] Can the trend toward integration that characterizes the modern world engender in the East something similar to the West's common European process? It was 3 years ago that the Soviet Union made an appeal from Vladivostok to seek the paths to restructuring in relations among states of the Asian and Pacific region so as to prevent it from becoming an arena of dangerous military confrontation. The "Vladivostok line" became a priority avenue in the USSR's foreign policy efforts side by side with plans to build a "common European home". In the opinion of the Beijing leadership, it was the Vladivostok speech that speeded up the process whereby the PRC and the USSR moved together toward a normalization of bilateral relations.

The summit meeting in Beijing had a profound and beneficial effect on Asia and the Pacific. By moving toward one another, the two neighboring socialist states refuted conjectures about the inevitability of prolonged enmity between them. Together, they removed a source of tension in the Far East, which had caused well-founded anxiety among the Asian peoples. The turn by Moscow and Beijing from confrontation to cooperation reflects the general trend that is emerging in Asia, and at the same time boosts it. Political life in Asia and the Pacific has clearly acquired new dynamism. A top-level Chinese-Indian meeting has taken place for the first time after a long interruption. The dialogue between Beijing and Hanoi has resumed. Vietnamese troops will be fully withdrawn from Cambodia by the end of September. Developments have also been noted in the problems of the Korean peninsula.

Speaking in Beijing to representatives of the Chinese public, M.S. Gorbachev expressed his conviction that there is a real possibility and need to find a common

denominator for the diverse interests and attitudes that exist in Asia and the Pacific. To this end it is necessary first of all to overcome any inclinations toward hegemonism and pressure and eliminate any interference in internal affairs. No one has the right to claim the role of "guarantor" of strategic, socioeconomic, and political security in Asia and the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Genuine security and stability may only be ensured by common efforts.

At the moment there are no established structures for talks in Asia and the Pacific and no mechanism for regular multilateral consultations, which are the reason why the common European process has gained strength with such conviction in recent years. So is it not time to stimulate what might be called a common Asian process, by the efforts of all the interested states and with the support of the United Nations? This idea has not yet met with a positive response everywhere. Certain capitals declare that first it is necessary to completely eliminate seats of regional conflict. But after all, life bears witness to the fact that such tasks are easier to resolve together. Is not this indicated by the prospects for a Cambodian settlement, which is becoming possible largely because practically all the Asian and Pacific countries, and others too, are participating in it to the extent of their powers?

Opponents of the Vladivostok initiative plead that the approach to strengthening security that arose in Europe cannot be transferred to Asia. Official circles in Tokyo, for example, set the precondition of resolving all "regional problems," in which they include the notorious question of the "northern territories." However, no matter how much Asian conditions differ from European ones, there is no doubt that the problems of security, confidence, and cooperation in this part of the world are no less pressing.

The thoughts expressed in Vladivostok and then amplified in Krasnoyarsk were a concrete realization of what was already "in the air," that is, what had been prompted by life. It is notable that Australian, Japanese, and American statesmen have this year put forward essentially similar proposals to create a mechanism of regular multilateral consultations in the region.

Australian Prime Minister Hawke put forward the idea of an "Asian-Pacific economic forum"—periodic meetings between representatives of 10 states of the western part of the Pacific Ocean and Southeast Asia: Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, and the 6 ASEAN members (Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei). Australia is proposing to host the first such meeting at ministerial level in November of this year.

Canberra's initiative, to all appearances, sparked off irritation in Washington, of which Tokyo was informed. Takeshita, the former Japanese prime minister, before leaving his post, visited the ASEAN countries. During this visit, he proposed to extend the planned Australian list from 10 to 15 states, adding the United States, and also Canada, China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. As for the Soviet Union, according to the statements made by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, its efforts toward regional cooperation are apparently mere propaganda, for the USSR supposedly has virtually no economic contacts with Asia and the Pacific.

Although Tokyo would not be averse to holding sway alone in the region, it petitioned for Washington's membership, apparently in the hope of using the Asian-Pacific community as a kind of shock absorber, softening the pressure of American goods on the Japanese and other Asian markets.

After Canberra had expressed its readiness to combine the Australian and Japanese proposals, another similar initiative was heard from Washington. A group of American senators proposed the idea of forming a "forum of the Pacific countries," where the heads of state and governments would regularly discuss political and economic problems and questions of security. According to Senator Cranston, the forum would not be directed against any particular country or group of countries and must not be regarded as an anticommunist organization.

This clarification is very valuable, in my view, as implementing the idea of a regional forum on a selective or, still more, a discriminatory basis would be counterproductive. Urgent tasks demand the internationalization of efforts. This applies to not only problems of security, but also environmental conservation, the elimination of consequences of natural disasters, the security of air and sea communication, and the struggle against international terrorism.

U.S. Secretary of State Baker described the formation of a mechanism for multilateral cooperation among the Pacific countries as an idea whose time has come. In his words, such a mechanism must recognize differences in the social and economic systems and the varying levels of development in the region. Baker expressed the intention of making a detailed study of the possibility of implementing this idea during his coming visit to Asia.

Incidentally, in response to the proposals voiced this year by Australia, Japan, and the United States, the states of Southeast Asia noted that that a fourth, tried and tested possibility exists. These are the annual conferences of ASEAN foreign ministers, which for some years now have traditionally coincided with meetings with "partners in dialogue"—the heads of the foreign policy departments of the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and a representative of the EEC. The next such conference will take place in Brunei 6-8 July. Baker's Asian trip will also be timed to coincide with this. This year's series of initiatives will be a subject of discussion there.

The Soviet Union has frequently stated that it has no intention of imposing some ready-made formula for

restucturing in relations in the region, but invites them to join in a discussion of this question. "The normalization of Chinese-Soviet relations is a step on the road to forming a new international political order. We hope that it will improve the whole complex of international relations," the Chinese periodical LIAOWANG writes. Supporting these words, I want to express the hope that relations between Moscow and Beijing in their qualitatively new phase will become a stabilizing factor in the region and a catalyst for the common Asian process.

NKVD Archive Said Key to Wallenberg Mystery

PM1207140189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 89 p 3

[Interview with Janos Zsolnay, member of the Hungarian "Wallenberg Association" presidium, by special correspondent Aleksey Kartsev under the "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Investigation" rubric: "Abduction in Budapest"—date not specified]

[Text] Budapest, Moscow—At the beginning of June we told readers about the tragic fate of Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg, who was abducted at the end of the war in Budapest and, according to the official information, subsequently died in Stalin's torture chambers. Despite a broad international campaign to find the missing diplomat, Wallenberg's name was surrounded by deep secrecy for many decades in both Hungary and our country. The Hungarian public were the first to mention Wallenberg, and at the end of last year a new public organization, the "Wallenberg Association," was founded in Hungary.

Our special correspondent Aleksey Kartsev visited the association and interviewed Janos Zsolnay, a member of the presidium.

[Kartsev] To be honest, Janos, I don't think that the Hungarians can complain about a lack of information on Wallenberg. Dozens of articles and books have been written about the Swedish diplomat and his part in rescuing civilians from fascist repression, and there is even a monument to Wallenberg in Budapest. Why, then, was it necessary to create another special association?

[Zsolnay] Our association is not a government organization but a public one and, in my view, the more such groups and associations there are to study their country's history and its "blank spots," the better that will be. We have done our utmost to emphasize that we are not a political party and that we are not struggling for a place in parliament but advocate dialogue with the government and joint action with it. We consider that the duty of our generation—the young Hungarians—is to find out the whole truth about Raoul Wallenberg.

[Kartsev] Excuse me, Janos, you keep on using the word "we." How many members does the association have?

[Zsolnay] A little over 300 at present. But when we were just beginning the work—we began 17 December last year—the "Wallenberg Association" consisted of just...seven people.

They were students and young historians and sociologists. Incidentally, even now the majority of our members are young people who love their country's history and are interested in it. Odd as it may seem, the association has just two age groups: Young people aged 20-30 and people over 60. Wallenberg himself rescued many of the latter from death during the war.

[Kartsev] Let us return to Wallenberg's fate. Have you managed to find out anything new about him?

[Zsolnay] Not yet. That is, we constantly learn various details about his activity in Hungary during the war because we are looking for people who were in contact with Wallenberg at that time. But the circumstances of Wallenberg's abduction and death remain shrouded in mystery: It will remain that way until such time as the NKVD's [People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs] secret archives from that period are published. After all, the only precise piece of information about the Swedish diplomat's disappearance is that he was last seen on 17 January 1945. Then begins a period in which the lack of documents permits nothing but hypotheses.

[Kartsev] Do you think, Janos, that the NKVD archives of that period could contain documents relating to Wallenberg's fate? After all, in response to Swedish government requests the appropriate Soviet agencies have examined the archives on a number of occasions. The only thing that they managed to find was an entry in the archives of the Lubyanka prison medical service by Colonel A.L. Smoltsov, medical service chief, that the prisoner Wallenberg died suddenly in his cell on 17 July 1947. The remaining documents, if they existed, could quite possibly have been destroyed on the orders of Abakumov, minister of state security at that time, who was later shot. So it looks as though there may be nothing in the archives....

[Zsolnay] I beg to differ. We discussed this problem with some of our special service officers, now retired, whose work after the war brought them into contact with their colleagues from the NKVD. They state that the NKVD devised the most detailed and sophisticated documentation system in the world from which it is virtually impossible to remove and destroy any documents of such great importance. And the story that, after being abducted in Budapest, taken to the Soviet Union, and detained in at least two different prisons (Lubyanka and Lefortovo) for almost 2 years there remained just one entry about the foreign diplomat in the service's archive seems debatable to us. Each of Wallenberg's moves was documented, and his "case" must surely run to more than one weighty tome. Furthermore, if Abakumov began destroying the documents on Wallenberg (and I believe that he had more important things to do), why

did he leave the entry on Wallenberg's "sudden" death, in other words, the very piece of evidence which ought to have been destroyed first of all? After all, Col Smoltsov made the entry on Wallenberg's death not in his personal diary, which he kept in a secret place, but in the medical service's official log. It would not have been particularly difficult for Abakumov's people to find that entry.

That is why we believe that the Wallenberg mystery remains a mystery and will be revealed only when the NKVD archive materials are made public.

[Kartsev] In addition to the official view, based on Smoltsov's record, there are various other opinions in the West about Wallenberg's fate. Some journalists, for example, are convinced that the Swedish diplomat was still alive in the late seventies. What is your association's opinion on that?

[Zsolnay] I have already said that there are many historians among us. Incidentally, I myself graduated 3 years ago from the Budapest University history department. Therefore it is our professional habit to trust only the facts, and at the moment there are not many of them. Our association has its own version of what happened to Wallenberg. But I stress that this is just one version. We believe that Wallenberg was killed in the early fifties when the campaign to combat "cosmopolitanism" began in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. After all, it is no secret that in fascist-occupied Budapest, Wallenberg saved the lives of several tens of thousands of Jews who had been condemned to death by the regime. It is probable that initially Wallenberg was suspected of spying for Germany (he had quite close contacts with many high-ranking officers in the fascist army), and then it became clear that he was the most real of "cosmopolitans" himself. Remember the "Doctors' plot": It was only the death of Stalin that saved them....

Incidentally, I would like to tell you that Wallenberg was given U.S. citizenship in absentia and that Congressman Thomas Lantos, a Hungarian by origin, is actively collecting materials on him in the United States. At the end of the war Wallenberg saved his and his wife's lives....

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh Viewed

LD2107011189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Excerpt] Moscow 20 Jul, by TASS observer Dmitriy Yakubov— Wide spheres of Soviet society relate negatively to any ethnic conflicts and together with the state organs, are striving to carry out measures to eliminate their causes. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that any thoughtless interference in such conflicts from the side not only does not led to calmness, but, on the contrary, enflames passions and leads to an escalation of enmity. It is precisely from this point of view that the U.S. senate resolution on Nagorno-Karabakh, endorsed on Wednesday 19 July in the form of a correction to the bill on State Department activities, attracts attention.

The resolution states that the people of the United States possess "strong historical and cultural links with the people of Armenia," and that the United States "strengthened its commitment to Armenia while taking part in the immediate efforts to provide aid to and to restore regions affected by the earthquake in December 1988." Indeed, such aid was provided, and not only the Armenian people, but al the peoples inhabiting the Soviet Union are deeply grateful to the American people for this selfless aid and the charity shown by them.

But at the same time the provisions of the resolution, interpreting the difficult work of the special administrative body set up by the Soviet leadership called upon to stabilize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, in a biased way, can only cause surprise. This administrative body of Nagorno-Karabakh has met with great difficulties in its work. Their main challenge is the necessity of administering a region which, from time immemorial, has been inhabited by representatives of two peoples whose relations have been characterized by enmity. However, unfortunately, the advice of the U.S. Senate to "encourage Soviet President Gorbachev to conduct substantive discussions with the chosen spokesmen of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh with regard to their demands for union with Armenia, and with the leadership of the Armenian democratic movement, which includes the recently released members of the Karabakh Committee" may be misinterpreted. Moreover, this advice might be exploited by extremist elements living in Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh as an appeal to wreck the cautious and considered steps being taken to stabilize the situation in and around Nagorno- Karabakh. It would be nice to think that Senator Claiborne Pell, who submitted this draft resolution in the Senate, was not striving to destablize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, but it is difficult to provide advice when one is thousands of miles away from the site of events and is unaware of the local state of affairs. As a result, his actions may, in this instance, prove to be in direct contradiction with his wishes, and this is something he should have thought about in advance.

Yakovlev Receives U.S., Italian Ambassadors

LD2007143189 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, today received U.S. Ambassador Jack Matlock at his request.

They discussed the state and prospects of Soviet-American relations, questions of limitation and reduction of nuclear and conventional arms, as well as some other issues of mutual interest. They stressed the importance of the current turning point in East- West relations from confrontation to constructive forms.

The same day, Yakovlev met Italian Ambassador to the Soviet Union Ferdinando Salleo to discuss matters of European security and cooperation and the current trends in Soviet-Italian relations caused by the development of European cooperation and changes in the Soviet Union.

U.S. Policy Toward Afghanistan Criticized

LD2007125289 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—By TASS news analyst Askold Biryukov:

The U.S. Administration cannot abandon its "strategy of competition" designed to ensure its dominance. The United States does not search for political clues to different problems but prefers to rely on force and modernised contemporary weapons.

This is true of U.S. policy towards Afghanistan. The signing of the Geneva accords and the Soviet troop withdrawal from that country were regarded by the United States not as the result of new thinking in Soviet foreign policy but as the result of an effective use of U.S. stinger missiles which helped neutralise low-flying Soviet-Afghan planes and helicopters and reverse the course of the military hostilities in favour of the rebels.

The United States seriously hoped that the Afghan Government would fall shortly after the Soviet troop withdrawal. However, time has proved that the anti-government troops cannot gain victory despite huge U.S. military and political aid.

Strikes delivered by the Afghan Army against the rebels have increased the discord in their ranks. The latest example of this disunity was a bloody massacre staged by the U.S. and Pakistani henchman Hikmatyar and his people over the field commanders of the Ahmad Shah Mas'ud opposition group.

Washington ought to anlayse the real causes of strength of the Kabul government which is seeking national reconciliation and the defeat of the opposition. Since the

Soviet troop withdrawal the opposition has been waging a war against its own people arousing their hatred and contempt.

Instead, the United States has decided to rely on force once again. It has armed the rebels with weapons capable of destroying airfields and planes on land. An administration spokesman said the rebels would be more capable of destroying airfields in the next few weeks or months.

He, apparently, did not think that the Afghan Army might also use the latest weapons to step up resistance and destroy the enemy bases, depots and training camps, and those who are pushing the opposition towards new crimes.

Washington claims that the United States has the right to increase arms supplies to the rebels, because the Soviet Union is helping the Afghan Government. But, this is only an excuse for refusing to search for a political settlement of the Afghan problem.

The Soviet Union has already suggested stopping arms deliveries to both sides and withdrawing the weapons already supplied from Afghanistan. Now, everything is up to Washington and its desire to end foreign interference in Afghan internal affairs.

Military Need for Stealth Bomber Questioned

PM2007105989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[Viktor Linnik dispatch: "Dream Flights and Real Flights"]

[Text] New York, 18 Jul—A few days ago it was shown on the country's television screens. Black, like a pterodactyl with its head cut off, the B-2 bomber, better known as "Stealth," gunned its engines, left its top-secret hangar in the Mojave Desert (California), and rolled smartly down the runway.

Announcers on all television channels had reported breathlessly on the upcoming first demonstration flight. However, on the appointed day the aircraft, having gathered speed for takeoff and having even lifted its nosewheel off the ground, suddenly throttled back sharply and came to a halt. A sensor on the instrument panel was showing insufficient fuel pressure. The crew took no risks and it was decided to postpone the demonstration flight. It did take place later, as already reported.

Clearly, the ballyhoo over the demonstration flight was intended to drown out somehow the quite harmonious and sizable chorus of skeptics in the U.S. Congress, who are looking with a heavy heart at the Pentagon's latest expensive toy.

The debates surrounding the B-2 mainly concern the cost of the aircraft, which exceeds $500 million. So far, $22.4 billion have been spent. And if you recall that it is proposed to produce 132 such "toys," the total cost of the program is really mind-boggling.

However, the price is only half the trouble, as the saying goes, although today the United States could clearly do with those billions to solve, for example, the problem of the country's homeless.

Specialists who are knowledgeable about military matters approach this problem from a different direction. "I do not see the military need to create a fleet of B-2's," retired Rear Admiral E. Carroll of the Defense Information Center says. "If it consists of launching these aircraft against the Soviet Union after a missile attack, then it is completely senseless, as the Soviet Union's air defenses would be practically destroyed. In that case we might just as well use B-47 bombers, which flew back in the Vietnam war, inside the Soviet Union. It is also clear that in time, Soviet technology will resolve the problem of the 'invisibility' of the B-2 and will be able to detect it with its air defense systems."

What do those who support the "Stealth" program say in response to this? "The B-2 will be a good bargaining chip in talks with the Soviet Union about limiting strategic offensive weapons," Republican Congressman R. Dornan alas advances a very familiar argument.

U.S. Expert Testifies in KAL-007 'Trial'

LD2107074989 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] New York July 20 TASS—The South Korean Boeing-747 airliner which violated Soviet air space on September 1, 1983, radioed false position reports, U.S. expert Frank Houston who took part in the investigation of the accident has stated in Washington.

In his opinion, a crew member probably misprogrammed one of the three computerized navigation systems aboard the jet before the Boeing-747 took off from Anchorage, Alaska. The crew of the KAL 007 flight bound from New York to Seoul was changed in Alaska. Chung, colonel of the South Korean Air Force, took over as flight commander. The jet began to deviate from the course right after the take-off in Anchorage.

According to Houston, the pilot, co-pilot and flight engineer ignored numerous other plane instruments and navigational aids on the ground as they flew some 480 kilometers off their assigned course. Houston testified on the second days of the trial in Washington at which relatives of the passengers of the airliner are trying to prove that the crew deliberately deviated from the course. "All three of them disregarded all those instruments?" asked Marshall Turner, the attorney representing the airline. "That is about what I am telling you, yes." replied Houston.

Turner tried to call in question Houston's conclusion that the plane had spent its last three hours over the Soviet

territory and dismissed it as "sheer speculation." However, Houston cited the available radar data and information provided by the Soviet and Japanese Governments. "There is mountains of evidence," he said. "So the crew thought they could sneak through Russia?" asked U.S. District Court Judge Aubrey Robinson. "The pilot may have believed he could get away with it," said Houston.

Sagan Call for U.S.-USSR Mars Venture Cited

PM2107084189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "Abroad": "Project of the Century?"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Jul—The U.S. Society for Planetary Research has proposed the planning and implementation of a joint Soviet-U.S. manned flight to Mars. Celebrating the 20th anniversary of U.S. astronauts' landing on the moon as part of the "Apollo" space program on 21 July 1969, this U.S. organization has called for a gigantic new breakthrough in the study of celestial bodies.

"U.S.-Soviet cooperation in the sphere of planetary research," Carl Sagan, the famous scientist and president of the society, stressed, "could put a man on Mars. That would be a colossal achievement also with regard to strengthening international security and stability."

This social organization has published a declaration urging the public, scientists, and members of government and parliament in the two countries to step up work to achieve this aim. Joint Soviet-U.S. efforts to prepare and implement a manned flight to Mars, the declaration points out, would open up a unique opportunity for our two countries to cooperate not only with each other but also with other peoples of the world. Joint work on a space project would serve as an example of Soviet-U.S. cooperation on earth. It would also open up broad opportunities for reorienting the military aerospace industry toward peaceful aims.

USSR Chemical Weapons Experts End Canada Visit

LD2007104589 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 20 Jul 89

[For further reportage of the visit, see page 21 of the 18 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT]

[Text] Ottawa, July 20 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Anatoliy Lazarev:

A group of Soviet chemical weapons experts on Wednesday [19 July] completed their visit to the Suffield experimental centre in the Canadian Province of Alberta.

The Canadians showed the visitors a facility for destroying chemical weapons stocks and other installations of the centre.

Specialists of the two countries had a lively discussion on technical data on chemical weapons elimination and related environmental protection measures.

Dr. John Mcandless of the centre told TASS that the dialogue had been very open, useful and successful, revealing common problems in the area of environmental protection during the destruction of chemical weapons.

He said the sides had exchanged information about norms in this area, existing in both countries.

Mcandless pointed to the high professional standards of the Soviet experts and said that they were easy to communicate with.

He also said both sides had expressed a mutual desire to continue such contacts, adding that they are of much more importance as they promote stronger confidence between the two countries.

Such bilateral contacts also indirectly accelerate progress toward a treaty on a complete and universal chemical weapons ban, Mcandless said.

Gen. R. Batsanov, head of the Soviet delegation, told the Canadian experts and reporters that the Soviet Union and the United States have come closer to the conclusion of an agreement on chemical weapons, although not all problems have been solved.

The general said the American side has not yet finished studying Soviet proposals on the procedure of holding on-site inspections.

"It is important that chemical weapons—these deadly means of mass annihilation—be eliminated," Batsanov said. "Everybody in the world will live a calmer life when these weapons no longer exist.

The Soviet experts had been invited to the Suffield centre early this year by the then Defence Minister Henry Perrin.

China

USSR-PRC Trade Commission Meets in Moscow

PRC Delegation Arrives

LD2007163489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1603 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow 20 Jul (TASS)—A delegation from the Chinese People's Republic led by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the PRC State Council, arrived in Moscow today to take part in the work of the fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Economic, Trade and Scientific-Technical Cooperation.

The delegation was met at the airport by Yuriy Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

Among the meeting party was Yu Hongliang, ambassador of the PRC to the USSR.

USSR-PRC Trade Talks Previewed

LD2007150789 Moscow TASS in english 1418 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—Trade turnover between the Soviet Union and China will grow by 20 per cent this year, a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR told TASS. This growth is stimulated by the increased interest of the two neighboring countries in cooperating with each other as well as by the current economic reforms under way in the Soviet Union and China. Sizable contracts have recently been concluded between Soviet and Chinese partners. Expanding economic cooperation involves power engineering, transport construction, fishing and other branches of the econony.

Ways to further increase the rate of economic interaction and new forms of developing business links will be identified at the fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technical Cooperation that will begin in Moscow on Friday [21 July]. A Chinese delegation headed by Politburo member and Deputy Premier of China's State Council Tian Jiyun arrives in Moscow today to take part in the session. The Soviet delegation will be led by Politburo alternate member Yuriy Maslyukov who is also first deputy premier in charge of the State Planning Committee.

Plenary and work group meetings will handle various aspects of trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation. Chinese delegation members are scheduled to visit industrial enterprises in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev.

USSR Official Comments on Session

LD2007194489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] I want to draw your attention, comrades, to a coming event. The fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Trade, and Scientific-Technical Cooperation opens in Moscow tomorrow. Here is an interview with the chairman of that commission, Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan]:

[Begin Maslyukov recording] The historic meeting of the highest leaders of our countries and the normalization of contacts between our two states and parties have turned a new page in the history of Soviet-Chinese contacts. The improvement of political relations gives a strong boost to the development of trade, economic, and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and China, from which political restrictions have now been lifted, and which is now becoming an important factor in the economy of both countries. Soviet-Chinese relations in the spheres of trade, economics, and science and technology can be treated on an integrated and long-term basis over the next few years and they can be developed activley and systematically on the basis of the principles of equality and mutual benefit.

It has to be frankly admitted that in cooperation between the USSR and the PRC, the existing scientific-technical and economic potential of the two countries is far from being fully utilized. We want to make the forthcoming session of the Soviet-Chinese summit in May. This is a matter of examining specific issues of cooperation between our countries in the field of the power industry, transportation, metallurgy, the aircraft and timber industries, light industry, agriculture, medicine, health, and so on.

In the current year a further increase in two-way trade between our countries is envisaged; it will evidently reach R2 billion, and may even exceed it. The Soviet side is willing to expand exports of machinery and equipment to China, including the technically complex items which the Chinese economy needs. Both sides agree that we have great potential for developing economic cooperation and raising it to a level appropriate to the size of our states.

Restructuring in the Soviet Union and reform in China, aimed at fully bringing out the advantages of socialism, are stimulating our mutual attraction and the common interest we have in establishing a cooperation that will help us to make use of each other's positive experiences. [end recording]

Song Jian Delegation Visit to Leningrad Outlined

OW2007213289 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 18 Jul 89

[Text] A Chinese Government delegation visited Piskarevo Cemetery in Leningrad. The delegation was attending Chinese science and technology month activities held in the Soviet Union. Song Jian, head of the delegation and Chinese state councillor and minister in charge of the State Science and Technology Commission, laid wreath at the monument for WWII war dead in Leningrad. He wrote an inscription in the VIP visitor's book: Eternal glory to the martyrs who gave their lives in the defense of Leningrad.

Moscow Weekly Deplores 'Tragedy' in China

OW2007151189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Announcer-read "excerpts" of an article by Goncharov, head of the Office on the Study and Prediction of Soviet-Chinese Relations under the Far Eastern Institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, published in the weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI—title of article and date of publication not given—from the "Program for Chinese Youth"]

[Text] Studying China's reality is my profession. For a long time, I have been in contact with China. The recent tragedy there has especially saddened me. The official

Soviet stance on this incident, already clearly stated by the Congress of People's Deputies, is undoubtedly aimed at safeguarding and strengthening the fruitful results of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations which recently occurred. In my opinion, this official stance has been made out of the consideration for reciprocity. Prior to the incident, the Chinese Government took a very discreet attitude toward unfortunate events in the Soviet Union.

Goncharov said: I believe that the Soviet stance is not to exploit China's deteriorating relations with the West in order to win the PRC over to the Soviet side to the detriment of the interests of the United States and other developed capitalist countries. In my opinion, the starting point for both the Soviet Union and China from now on should remain that restoration of the relations of military and political alliance that existed in the 1950's is not in line with the interests of our two countries; nor is it in the interests of peace and stability in the world.

Goncharov said: In view of the sanctions imposed on China by the United States and other Western countries, China is very likely to expand its trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union. However, I think this is merely a natural response under the current circumstances. It is by no means a step toward a certain bilateral strategic alliance. I am of the belief that my country hopes to see normal stable relations between China and the West. The Soviet Union has paid keen attention to the causes and lessons of the incident in China, and will try to stop unhealthy tendencies and take precautionary measures to eliminate the root causes, as it would have to pay too great a price to solve problems with force after they have occurred.

Turning to the prospects for China's development in the near future, Goncharov said: I feel that the Chinese leaders' policy of reform and opening to the outside world will be continued. To this end, it may be necessary to take a series of extremely complex and radical measures, such as dismissing functionaries who have committed embezzlement and accepted bribes, more strictly controlling population growth, further cutting back capital construction, and so forth. It may be anticipated that China will tighten policy in the ideological realm. I believe that the Chinese leaders will not broaden the scale of suppression, out of concern for their prestige. I disagree with some Western analysts who assert that China is in a state of civil war and that it has instituted a rigorous totalitarian rule.

In conclusion, Soviet China expert Goncharov said: However, I would like to repeat that there will be genuine stability in China only after the sources of instability are eliminated.

Northeast Asia

General Moiseyev Cited on Japanese Security Treaty

Suggests USSR-Japanese Peace Treaty

OW1907114889 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] According to Yamauchi, our Moscow correspondent, Colonel General Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, has indicated a posture to tacitly acknowledge the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and has proposed that a multinational negotiating organization be set up to discuss the Asian security issue. He made these comments in reply to written questions submitted by NHK.

With regard to the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, Chief of the General Staff Moiseyev said that it is each nation's right to decide on the conclusion of treaties. However, he added, the fact that a powerful Japan-U.S. military bloc has been created in the vicinity of the Soviet border cannot be disregarded.

One of the effective ways to relax tension in the Asian and Pacific region, he noted, would be to conclude a Japanese-Soviet peace treaty.

At the Japanese-Soviet foreign ministers meeting in May, the Soviet Union indicated a new view tolerance of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. But this is the first time that a Soviet military leader has affirmed this directly.

While criticizing the fact that the growth in Japan's defense spending is the biggest among the developed Western nations, Gen Moiseyev said that the Soviet forces deployed in the northern territories are small in scale and designed to guard the borders. He stated that the Soviet Government is not considering their withdrawal. He thus confirmed that these forces will not be included in the Soviet Union's plans to reduce its Armed Forces in the Far East, announced by the Soviet Government.

The chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces also said that the normalization of relations between China and the Soviet Union will help to improve relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. At the same time, he suggested that a multinational negotiating organization on security should be established to ease tension in Asia.

Comments on USSR Far East Troops

OW1907112089 Tokyo KYODO in English 1056 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, July 19 KYODO—The Soviet Union will not withdraw its troops deployed on the four Soviet-held islands off Hokkaido, the chief of the Soviet Armed Forces said Wednesday.

The remarks made it clear for the first time that a plan to withdraw 120,000 Soviet soldiers from the Soviet Far East announced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in May does not include Soviet troops on the islands.

Gen. Mikhail A. Moiseyev, general chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, made the remark in a written answer responding to a questionnaire on arms reduction prepared by the Moscow bureau of the KYODO News Service.

Gorbachev promised to reduce the number of Soviet troops stationed in the Far East when he visited Beijing May 15-18.

Moiseyev described the Soviet troop contingent stationed on the islands as small and as defensive in nature, and added that Japan's continued military buildup is threatening to the Soviet Union.

Moiseyev, however, reiterated the Soviet view that the Japan-U.S. security treaty would not be a stumbling block to concluding a peace treaty between Japan and the Soviet Union.

A treaty would help ease political and military tensions in the Asia-Pacific region and promote arms reduction in the area, he added.

Japan and the Soviet Union do not have a peace treaty because of the long-standing territorial dispute over the four islands.

On the military situation on the Korean Peninsula, Moiseyev called for the total withdrawal of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea, which he said are root causes of the tension on the divided peninsula.

'Source' Expands on Moiseyev Remarks

OW2007092489 Tokyo KYODO in English 0847 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Tokyo, July 20 KYODO—A scaling down of the Soviet military presence on a group of northern Pacific islands claimed by Japan is contingent on a reformed Japanese attitude toward Soviet confidence-building proposals in the region, a Soviet diplomatic source said here Thursday.

The source expressed dismay that Japan has stood out, even in comparison with its Western allies, in its pessimistic approach to the various proposals advanced by Moscow for stability in the Asia-Pacific region and a lessening of East-West tension.

Along that line, Japan and the United States must adopt a more productive attitude before Moscow can consider Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's proposed reduction of Soviet Far East military forces by 120,000 men over two years as encompassing the four islands claimed by Japan, the source said.

"The islands are theoretically included," he said. "But when we consider the breakdown of the reduction proposal, there is a link between Japan's attitude and exactly what will be reduced."

The source was expanding on remarks made Wednesday [19 July] to KYODO news service by Gen. Mikhail A. Moiseyev, general chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, who said that the troop cut plan does not apply to the islands.

Moiseyev's remarks were initially taken as a concrete decision to exclude the islands, but the diplomatic source confirmed that Moscow still does not "rule out" their conditional inclusion.

The source noted that Japan has consistently brushed off Soviet peace initiatives, such as a proposal for expert-level military talks and an invitation to observe Soviet naval exercises in the Japan Sea.

While the Soviets are purposefully scaling down the size of their naval exercises, the U.S. and Japan appear recently to be expanding theirs, the source said, adding, "we cannot overlook this."

The source rejected Japan's "unproductive" attempts to tie the bilateral territorial dispute to wider global issues such as the Kampuchean conflict.

He said the so-called Northern Territories question is being properly taken up in the context of a working group set up by both sides to discuss matters standing in the way of a belated peace treaty.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Philippine's Manglapus Concludes USSR Visit

Comparison of Gorbachev-Manglapus Talks

PM2107082989

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 July 1989 publishes in its Second Edition on page 1 a TASS report on the 19 July talks between M.S. Gorbachev and Philippine Foreign Minister Manglapus. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "M.S. Gorbachev Receives Raul Manglapus," with the Moscow TASS in English version published on page 24 of the 20 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT reveals the following variations:

column one, penultimate paragraph, first sentence of the PRAVDA version reads: Mikhail Gorbachev received 19 July Philippine Foreign Minister... (omitting dateline, rewording, subbing "19 July" for "today");

same sentence of the PRAVDA version reads: ...President Corazon Aquino's personal message to Mikhail... (subbing "personal" for "special");

last paragraph, last sentence of the PRAVDA version reads: ...links which have emerged and developed with this... (adding "emerged and");

column two, paragraph four, only sentence of the PRAVDA version reads: ...asked to convey greetings and best wishes to... (adding "greetings and").

Economic, Technical Pact Detailed

HK2007045189 Manila MANILA BULLETIN in English 20 Jul 89 pp 1, 15

[By Romy V. Mapile]

[Text] Moscow (Via Philcom [Philippine Communications])—Foreign Affairs Secretary Raul S. Manglapus and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze signed yesterday [19 Jun] the first RP [Republic of the Philippines]-Soviet economic and technological exchange agreement, a cultural protocol, and a memorandum of intent to negotiate and exchange real estate for the use of diplomatic missions.

In talks that lasted five hours, including a brief lunch, the two foreign ministers discussed proposals for improved bilateral relations, the world situation, and preparations for the visit here of President Aquino in spring next year.

At dinner in honor of Manglapus that concluded the talks, Shevardnadze stressed anew Soviet policies on "perestroyka" (restructuring) and "glasnost" (openness), "which is the platform that we would like to develop with the Philippines and interact with your country in international affairs with a view to enhancing security and expanding cooperation in Asia and the Pacific region."

Manglapus said the recently signed long-term umbrella agreement covers a wide range of development projects that would explore the terms of reference of a joint commission that would oversee such cooperation.

"Many more agreements between us. I am sure, will be negotiated, formulated, and signed to prove how enduring our relations can be, and we are fast moving towards the day when we shall regard each other with absolutely no reservations," Manglapus said.

During the talks, Shevardnadze cited the visit of Manglapus as "a landmark in RP-Soviet relations as the first of a Philippine foreign minister to the Soviet Union.

"The democratic process between the two countries will intensify the relations in the interest of world peace," the Soviet leader said.

Manglapus thanked the Soviet Government for facilitating the accreditation of Ambassador Juan V. Saez and expressed the hope that some projects in the signed agreements would have been accomplished before the visit of President Aquino.

Shevardnadze also assured Manglapus of non-interference in domestic affairs, including its relations with third countries. He said that the Philippines may even contribute to Soviet relations with the U.S.

Manglapus said the Philippines hopes the Soviets understand that it takes time to develop relations "in the light of historical experiences." He added that the issues on military bases in foreign soil would be eliminated by the year 2000, adding that "there are certain sectors in the Philippines suggesting an earlier period."

The two leaders agreed on working out an agreement on maximum 20-day visas, meteorology, and official exchange of parliamentarians, economic missions, particularly in agric-business.

President Aquino To Visit USSR in 1990

HK2007041389 Manila BUSINESS STAR in English 20 Jul 89 p 12

[By Rene Pastor]

[Text] President Aquino will be visiting the Soviet Union anytime between April and June next year, the foreign affairs department said yesterday.

The department's public affairs office released a telex sent by the Philippine embassy in Moscow where Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze agreed to set up "working groups to prepare for President Aquino's visit to the Soviet Union in the spring of next year."

The trip will be the second made by a Philippine president since diplomatic ties were opened between the two countries in the mid-seventies. Former president Ferdinand Marcos met then Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev when the ties were established in 1976.

Shevardnadze called the visit of Mrs. Aquino "a turning point" in relations between the two countries, and hinted that "a significant document" will be signed by her and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev during the visit.

The trip is expected to boost Soviet-Philippine trade which declined sharply from a high of over $300 million early in the decade to a little over $40 million last year.

Soviet ambassador to Manila Oleg Sokolov told reporters before flying to Moscow to join the welcome delegation for Manglapus that the ideal time for Mrs. Aquino to visit the Soviet Union would be "late May to late July." He said the weather would be ideal then for the visit.

Shevardnadze told Manglapus that no Soviet missiles were aimed at U.S. bases in the Philippines with both sides expressing the hope that the level of military confrontation in the region will sharply decline by the year 2000. The Soviet government considers the issue of removing the U.S. bases in the Philippines a matter for Manila and Filipinos to resolve, according to Shevardnadze.

Mrs. Aquino's trip was set for this year but was postponed for 1990 because it came in conflict with her week-long trip to West Germany, France and Belgium.

The two foreign ministers hope to implement the cultural and economic agreements they signed yesterday by the time the President goes to Moscow.

The Aquino government has been slowly expanding ties with socialist countries in an effort to end its traditional dependence on the United States, which maintains two major military bases in this former U.S. colony.

The lease on Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base, the largest U.S. military bases overseas, expires in 1991. Exploratory talks on an extension of the lease are expected to start late this year.

Moscow has called for the dismantling of the bases and offered to pull out its forces from Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay. Washington has dismissed the idea.

Shevardnadze said Manila "might be able to contribute to the improvement of Soviet-American relations," without giving details.

Shevardnadze assured Manglapus that the "Soviet Union will not interfere in Philippine relations with the United States," and predicted that all military bases on foreign soil will be removed by the year 2000.

The department said Manglapus was expected to deliver a letter to Aquino from Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev after his Moscow trip.

In a statement released by the official TASS news agency, the ministers declared to further raise the level of the entire range of Soviet-Philippine relations with due respect for their ties with third countries.

The ministers underlined mutual interests in the joint search for new forms and directions of cooperation including the trade and economic sphere, in strengthening the basis for the activity of Soviet and Philippine organizations.

Both sides underscored the need to accomplish urgent tasks like ending the arms race, preventing its spillover into space, fostering extensive international cooperation in the efforts to combat poverty, disease and hunger, and to prevent ecological catastrophe.

The two ministers said that the process of the improvement of the political atmosphere is gaining strength in the Asia-Pacific region. Manglapus evaluated Soviet-Chinese normalization as a factor making for stability in that part of the world.

At the same time, the two officials expressed concern over the continued militarization of the Asia-Pacific region and the high level of military confrontation there. They noted that the dialogue between the Indochinese states and Asean countries is being vigorously developed as good neighborliness and cooperation is increasing.

Shevardnadze reaffirmed the Soviet Union's support for the plans to create a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in Southeast Asia and stated readiness to begin consultations on the key components of the concept of a nuclear-free zone in the region as proposed by the Asean countries.

Manglapus said that the Philippine government highly appreciates the USSR's stand on problems pertaining to developing countries' foreign debt.

Rogachev Sees Off Manglapus

LD2107093289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0747 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 21 Jul (TASS)—Philippine Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus, who was in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government, left Moscow today. He was seen off at the airport by Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

More on Ryzhkov Talks With Singapore's Cheong

PM2107085589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] In the Kremlin 19 July N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Ong Teng Cheong, deputy prime minister of Singapore and general secretary of the Singapore National Trade Union Congress, who is the Soviet Union at the invitation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU].

On both sides during the conversation it was noted with satisfaction that recently the development of Soviet-Singapore relations has been going from strength to strength. The Soviet Union, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers said, is ready to cooperate in this process in every way possible in all spheres which also interest the Singapore side.

Ong Teng Cheong talked about the great attention and sympathy with which Singapore interprets the restructuring policy being carried out in the Soviet Union and its peace-loving foreign policy initiatives.

An exchange of opinions took place regarding possible paths for expanding trade and economic ties between the USSR and Singapore on a mutually advantageous basis. In particular, they noted the usefulness of stepping up the joint search for new forms of cooperation, including setting up joint enterprises both on USSR territory and in Singapore, and the mutual desire was expressed to utilize more fully the potential for this which is being

opened up as as result of the economic reform being carried out in the Soviet Union. It is thought expedient to examine the question of setting up an intergovernmental commission on economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

In discussing the international situation it was noted that the positive tendencies gathering strength in the world are also having an effect on the situation in the Asia-Pacific region. Stressing that the well-known Soviet proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk remain in force, N.I. Ryzhkov drew attention to the need to reduce the level of military confrontation in this extensive region of the world in the interests of the security of all the states located here.

The sides noted that the situation had improved in Southeast Asia, where confrontation is beginning to give way to mutual understanding and a rejection of mutual accusations and attacks. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers welcomed the fact that the states of ASEAN and Indochina are establishing a closer relationship in the work for a political settlement to the Cambodian problem and expressed the hope that their joint efforts in this direction will gradually open up prospects for establishing lasting peace in Southeast Asia.

The following took part in the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere: V.G. Lomonosov, deputy chairman of the AUCCTU; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; A.M. Dryukov, Soviet ambassador to Singapore; and also Chiang Hai Ding, Singapore ambassador to the USSR.

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah, USSR Ambassador Interviewed

PM1107103289 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 8 Jul 89

[Report from Afghanistan by Hilary Lawson, including undated interviews with President Najibullah and Soviet Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov, monitored in progress in the framework of the Channel 4 "The World This Week Program" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted]

[Lawson] The man the Soviets backed for 3 years and the man who had to watch them leave—President Najibullah —is confident.

[Najibullah, in Dari with superimposed English translation] They said that within days the Kabul regime would collapse. But it didn't happen.

[Lawson] But predicting the fall of Kabul is not the only thing Najibullah thinks the West has got wrong.

[Najibullah] They said that we were a communist government. But I have repeatedly stated that our regime is neither communist nor socialist. Why is there this enmity from the United States towards a democratic regime? Perhaps not now but in the future people will realize that the United States is mistaken in its policy towards Afghanistan. [passage omitted]

[Lawson] The government has offered the commanders a place in a broad-based government, in addition to allowing them to retain their arms and land.

[Najibullah] We have signed agreements with many field commanders in contacts, and talks are continuing with many others. Perhaps you are going to ask me who they are and what kind of things are being dicussed.

[Lawson] That is correct.

[Najibullah] I think it is not the right time to reveal which groups they are and what we are discussing, and that it would not help the progress of the talks.

[Lawson] Are there understandings already in place with mujahidin commanders that you are not in a position to make public?

[Najibullah] Yes, understandings are in place.

[Lawson] But political leaders and rebel commanders in the field deny the existence of such deals, not wishing to declare any association with the government before it's clearly going to survive. Through the haze of propaganda, an indication of the real military strength of the regime and the existence of deal with local commanders are the supplies entering Kabul along the three main arteries into the city. [passage omitted]

[Lawson] The one man in Afghanistan who could bring a rapid end to Najibullah's government, Soviet Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov, has no doubts.

[Vorontsov, in English] Sometimes to please the Americans maybe they [the mujahidin commanders] are saying, "Oh no, we never will look in the direction of Najibullah." They are sitting here and discussing things—many of them.

[Lawson] Do you think that's true? I mean, it's very difficult to discover whether the commanders really are talking to the government....

[Vorontsov, interrupting] They are.

[Lawson] ...or whether there is just a pretense that they are.

[Vorontsov] I happen to know: They are talking.

[Lawson] Do you think there are already implicit deals in place between the government and individual field commanders?

[Vorontsov] Yes. Many things will be evident pretty soon. Now they are in secret.

[Lawson] When you say "pretty soon," over what sort of period of time, do you think?

[Vorontsov] That's difficult for me to say. I don't know day-by-day progress in their negotiations, but pretty soon. Months—within a month, month-and-a-half.

[Lawson] But even if Najibullah is safe inside his presidential palace, he may be a victim of his Army's success. Facing defeat, key mujahidin commanders may be prepared to join a national government, but in exchange demand his resignation. So far the Russians are standing firm.

[Vorontsov] People are suggesting that we abandon them. Why should we?

[Lawson] Would you be prepared to see Najibullah resign or to encourage a situation where he did resign in order to gain a broad-based government of that sort?

[Vorontsov] I don't see in what possible way that could encourage the way for the broad-based government. It would encourage the way to anarchy in the country, that's for sure.

[Lawson] In a bid to broaden support for his government Najibullah claims that he is prepared to make major changes.

[Najibullah] We have declared that we are prepared to give up the monopoly of power; to have political pluralism, economic pluralism, an open economy; to attract foreign investment; to strengthen the private sector. So far in response to this we have not received any single proposition from the other side.

[Lawson] But his proposals are not enough for the U.S. and Pakistan. Following their recent meeting in Washington Bush and Bhutto said they wanted a political solution, but they also demanded Najibullah's resignation.

[Najibullah] On the one hand they say they want a political solution; on the other they want to keep up military pressure on the Najibullah regime. So we don't consider these assertions to be serious or sincere. I'm not thinking about myself in the price of peace. Don't you think that making such a suggestion is an interference in the domestic affairs of Afghanistan? If Najibullah said today that he will be prepared to continue negotiations if Benazir Bhutto resigned, wouldn't that be called an interference in Pakistan's affairs? Of course it would. People shouldn't impose on others what they would not want for themselves.

[Lawson] The Americans have asked for talks with the Soviets on Afghanistan later this month. If they're hoping for the sacrifice of Najibullah they're in for a surprise.

[Vorontsov] That policy is a dead end. Because they will say, "OK, you've changed this person, but then please, another one. This one also should be changed. And then this one, and then this one...." And then we are talking about something else. We are not talking about Afghanistan, we are not talking about the interests of the field commanders, we are not talking the interests of Shias, we are not talking about many, many other things: We are talking about changes in the government of Kabul—which solves nothing. They have simplified view of the situation. They have the Kabul.... Several people here, they must be changed, everything will be nice: Nothing doing.

[Lawson] For a decade U.S. policy in Afghanistan has been designed to force the Soviet troops to withdraw. Having succeeded in this aim, the Americans find themselves in the position of supporting fundamentalists against a regime that claims to be potentially democratic.

[Najibullah] We have said that we are ready for elections. So far no opposition forces have declared that they are ready. They are not in favor of democracy. They are extremists, fundamentalists, and fanatics, of whom the U.S. has already had bitter experience. The opposition claim that people are with them. If so, let us try democracy. If the U.S. really believes in championing democracy, it should be supporting us.

[Lawson] The Americans, according to the Soviets, are being lured into a policy against their own interests.

[Vorontsov] They are sitting among the mujahidin in Peshawar and they are listening to what the mujahidin are selling them in both their ears. And that is, they're basing their policy on this, on wishful thinking, on greed of getting more money from the Americans, and this, and this.... And that's a strange way of arranging the policy of a big nation like the United States.

[Lawson] But they cannot really want a fundamentalist government.

[Vorontsov] Actually, that is against their interests, but what they are doing shows that they want to have a fundamentalist government in Kabul. [Passage omitted]

'Armed Opposition' Continues Afghan Conflict

LD2007204989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Commentary by Boris Andrianov]

[Text] [Announcer] According to reports from Kabul, Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, has sent a message to Khamene'i, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran, in connection with the extension of the scale of aggression by Pakistan against the Republic of Afghanistan. It is noted in this document that flouting the Geneva agreements and the norms of international law, the Pakistani military clique, with the support of its hirelings, is intensifying its interference in the internal

affairs of a sovereign state and this interference is increasingly acquiring a roguish and terrorist character. The Iranian people, it is stressed in the message, cannot remain indifferent to the grief and sufferings of the Afghan Muslims and must play an important role in stopping the bloodshed on Afghan soil. I pass the microphone to my colleague, the commentator Boris Andrianov:

[Andrianov] Those massed rocket bombardments of Afghan towns, which the formations of the armed opposition are carrying out with the support of the United States and Pakistan, cannot be called by any decent person anything other than open brigandage and plain terror. What governs these hirelings, who inflict barbaric strikes on the peaceful population and whom some people across the ocean continue to call freedom fighters? Most likely malicious revenge for the failed plans to overthrow the power of the people in Kabul and get control of the whole situation in Afghanistan after the withdrawal of Soviet forces. We are already in the 6th month since our last soldier left Afghan territory. However, for some reason, nothing is heard about the imminent victory of the armed opposition, although it was publicized at one time very persistently in certain circles beyond the frontiers of Afghanistan. The hirelings have not been successful in getting control of a single major town, not to mention of Kabul. For all that, how many of them have fallen before Jalalabad alone during the frequent but fruitless stormings of this administrative center of the province of Nangarhar? And now the formations of the armed opposition are operating on the principle that since they do not have the strength to seize the town, it is necessary to destroy it, sow panic among the population, and force people to flee from the dead zone into which the hirelings plan to turn everything that gives a worthy repulse to their pretentions. Hundreds of peaceful inhabitants are counted among the victims of the mass missile bombardment of Afghan towns. After this, how can one say that the mujahidin are allegedly carrying on the struggle for the freedom of the people of Afghanistan, if they are in practice fighting the people itself. For this reason, in wide circles of the world community, the demand that an end should be put to massed foreign interference on the side of the forces of the so-called irreconcilable Afghan opposition is put more and more decisively.

And how are the Washington officials conducting themselves in this situation? Judge for yourselves. According to reports from Islamabad, the representative of the United States, called the U.S. ambassador to the Afghan armed opposition, speaking at a press conference in the Pakistani capital, announced that Washington would supply the formations of the mujahidin with weapons of a higher quality, and, as if supporting this promise, U.S. Secretary of State Baker, when in The Hague, stressed that the policy of the Washington administration toward the armed Afghan opposition has not changed.

Why not recall here another statement of the very same James Baker, that the United States would like to see Afghanistan a sovereign, neutral, non-aligned state, which would not have hostile relations to the Soviet Union. A well-intentioned promise, it would seem. Why, in that case, did the U.S. side fruitlessly abandon the specific proposals of the Soviet Union aimed at the development of the inter-Afghan dialogue at the calling of an international conference with the participation of the neighboring countries of Afghanistan, to settle the Afghan problem?

Yes, the true value of those statements, which the leaders of the United States, Pakistan, and other countries which are guardians of the Afghan opposition made, when they shed crocodile tears about the struggles of the Afghan people, which had allegedly come under the yoke of a regime of occupation, now appears very graphically before the whole world. Where has this affected sympathy gone, now that none of them is calling on the armed opposition to end the fratricide and to concern itself with a peaceful settlement at the negotiating table in the name of the national revival of Afghanistan? Moreover, there were the weepers about the bitter fate of the Afghan people. Now they are inciting the irreconcilables to extend active combat actions, are increasing the supply of contemporary weapons, are sending their advisers and even subunits of the regular army. As a result the bloodshed in Afghanistan is intensifying, turning into a genuine civil war. The conflict itself, which is growing more and more, threatens to spread into neighboring countries. The very development of these tragic events confirms that the Afghan problem cannot be solved by military means. The latter way is not only hopeless but extremely dangerous. There is only one way of finally untying the tightened knot of the Afghan conflict: to strictly fulfill all the provisions of the Geneva agreements, which the world community is persistently demanding. There is no other alternative.

Commentary Views Iran's Presidential Candidates

NC2007155289 Moscow in Persian to Iran
1500 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Andrey Krasnov commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Excerpts] The pre-election campaign in Iran is intensifying. On 28 July this year, that is, in exactly 9 days, Iran's presidential elections will take place. A total of 24 million are expected to cast their votes during these elections. Our commentator, Andrey Krasnov, writes:

Currently the rivalry for the presidency is between two candidates, Majlis Speaker 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani and 'Abbas Sheybani, political personality (?since the onset) of the revolution. Both personalities, each with a rich political past, are claiming the position of president. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani is known as a person with key positions in the Iranian leadership. He was imprisoned several times during the shah's regime. [passage omitted]

'Abbas Sheybani is from the Freedom Movement of Iran which is led by former prime minister Mehdi Bazargan. He, too, was imprisoned several times during the shah's regime. [passage omitted]

A recent poll in the country showed that 86 percent of the voters intend to vote for 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. 'Abbas Sheybani was able to win only 11 percent of the voters.

This immense distance between the two candidates is not accidental. 'Abbas Sheybani is participating on behalf of a small liberal group in elections which (?lack) [word indistinct]; and this is at a time when 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani leans on the entire political and ideological system of the Islamic Republic. Iran's religious leader Ayatollah Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i, 190 Majlis deputies, student unions, the women's organization, clergymen, and other organizations have supported him. All political observers believe that 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani will win in the upcoming presidential elections.

The fact is that 'Abbas Sheybani currently is not demonstrting serious activity. He has not proposed an alternative program, and on the whole he is supporting a government he often criticizes.

Meanwhile, 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani published a large program recently in JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI, in which he supported Iran's cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, stating that this cooperation is natural.

Many hope that the 54-year old religious figure 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani will be able to ensure an active and logical leadership for the country.

Commentator Interviewed on Iranian Elections

NC2007161889 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Aleksandr Batyev interviewed on the feature entitled: "On the Waves of Radio Moscow"]

[Text] Dear listeners, we asked Radio Moscow commentator Aleksandr Batyev to comment on the pre-election campaigns in Iran.

[Batyev, speaking in Russian, fading into Persian translation] First, I saw a very favorable personality—'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani—emerge a long time before the elections, and I foresee, even now, that the creditable Majlis speaker will win in the presidential elections. Second, in pre-election campaigns, economic issues are usually intense. This is not suprising at all in view of the vital problems tht Iran faces at the start of its process of economic reconstruction. For example, according to some figures the growth in inflation alone reached 50 percent, something which leads to high prices. Thus, it is not accidental for the voters to prefer Hashemi-Rafsanjani. He promises that if he wins, he will ensure a rapid economic growth.

[Announcer, in Persian] How can this objective be achieved? At a time when Tehran has, until now, been declaring a program of development and progress by relying only on its own forces, then both the process of reconstruction and the solution to vital economic and social problems can take many years.

[Batyev, in Russian fading into Persian translation] Yes. However, maintaining a low standard of living for a long time also threatens to bring social instability. When Mr Hashemi-Rafsanjani speaks about the need immediately to solve problems concerning inflation, high prices, and unemployment, he definitely takes this situation into consideration because, as he says himself, postponing a solution will make these problems more difficult and more complicated in the future.

[Announcer, in Persian] Therefore, what specific steps can be taken to this end?

[Batyev, in Russian fading into Persian translation] (?Apparently) they will have to receive more assistance from foreign countries. For example, measures to facilitate the import of consumer products and raw materials may be announced. At this moment, Hashemi-Rafsanjani is proposing that the Qeshm Port in the Persian Gulf be declared a free port. The Majlis speaker believes that Iranian citizens can purchase goods there, that the increase in prices will be thus stopped, and that investment in Iran can be ensured.

[Announcer, in Persian] However, the best way to achieve this goal will be through large credits from abroad. Do you believe that Iran will receive large credits from foreign countries?

[Batyev, in Russian, followed by translation in Persian] I do not think so, at least in the beginning. Tehran is still very concerned about the fact that large loans from abroad can place Iran under the yoke of dependence. Those who believe in this have the right to think so on the basis of their logic. Iran's economy has weakened very much since the war and certain circles in the West may want to exploit this situation. Tehran was able in only one case to receive favorable assistance, and I refer to its relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has extended a total of $2 billion with no strings attached. As for the Western countries, I think that only after its reconstruction and ensuring the progress of its oil refinery industries, and once it starts receiving a large income from its oil (?exports) will Iran give in to large credits from Western countries, and it is then that Iran will be much more confident in the financial market.

Indian Chief Air Marshal Mehra Visits USSR

Arrives in Moscow 18 Jul

PM2007151789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jul 89 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official Visits"]

[Text] Chief Air Marshal S.K. Mehra, chief of staff of the Indian Air Force, arrived in the Soviet Union 18 July on an official visit at the invitation of Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister.

The guest was met at Sheremetyevo Airport by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov and other generals and officers.

The welcoming party included P.K. Budhwar, deputy ambassador of the Republic of India to the USSR.

Meets With Yazov 20 Jul

LD2007140489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1312 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jul (TASS)—Surindra Kumar Mehra, chief of staff of the Air Force of the Republic of India, chief marshal of aviation, termed each of his contacts with Soviet commanders "exclusively fruitful and useful." He gave an interview to TASS correspopndent Oley Moskovskiy in connection with the start of his official visit to the Soviet Union, noting that "the hospitality and friendliness of the Soviet people causes true delight to all Hindus."

Today, the Indian commander was received by Army General Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense. A conversation took place during which questions of mutual interest were discussed. The USSR minister of defense expressed deep satisfaction over the state of Soviet-Indian relations in the military sphere. "We ascertain with joy: Friendly relations between the USSR and India, between the peoples of our countries, their armed forces, are strengthening and developing from year to year." In the view of Dmitriy Yazov, a new impetus to these relations was given by the recent visit to the Soviet Union of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi.

Chief Marshal of Aviation Mehra also noted the exclusive significance of contacts between Soviet and Indian military leaders at all levels, and expressed the hope that this meeting will also be constructive.

Yesterday, Marshal Mehra visited an air garison in the Moscow Oblast town of Kubinka. He familiarized himself with modern Soviet aviation equipment on the ground and in the air. The guest spoke highly of the combat possibilities of Soviet planes.

During his 9-day official visit to the USSR, the guest from India will become acquainted with the life and service of troops of the infantry forces and aviation. During his stay in the Baltic region town of Riga and the hero city of Leningrad he will visit their historical and cultural sights.

General Kochetov Ends Visit to Kuwait 20 Jul

Seen Off by Kuwaiti Officials

LD2007185989 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Kuwait July 20 TASS—USSR Army General Konstantin Kochetov, first deputy defence minister of the USSR, ended his official visit to Kuwait and left for home today in the morning.

He was seen off at the airport by Major General Jabir al-Khalid al-Sabah, deputy head of the General Staff of the Kuwaiti Armed Forces, and other Kuwaiti generals and offices.

Kochetov Assesses Visit to Kuwait

LD2107094789 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS—"The visit to Kuwait has been very useful. It promoted confidence-building measures and cooperation between our countries", Army General Konstantin Kochetov, first deputy defence minister of the USSR, told TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy today in an interview on the occasion of the completion of his four-day official visit to that Arab country.

According to General Kochetov, in the course of meetings and negotiations Kuwaiti military leaders expressed the desire to continue developing and strengthening the friendly and constructive dialogue in the military area. "The visit has been a contribution to the development of mutual relations between the USSR and Kuwait", the general said. "Friendly and strong contacts in the military area promote consolidation of economic and cultural relations", he believes.

An exchange of opinions with Kuwaiti Defence Minister Sheikh Nawwaf al-Ahmad al-Jabir al-Sabah, other military leaders, "was open and frank", General Kochetov said. "We have reaffirmed our support for Kuwaiti steps to bring a fair and durable peace to that explosive region of the world", the general said.

The visit has reaffirmed that the USSR and Kuwait are interested in the development of friendly relations, General Kochetov stressed.

Postwar Situation Inside Iraq Highlighted

PM1907160389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jul 89 First Edition p 3

[Major V. Yaremenko article: "Iraq: Time of Change"]

[Text] It is a hot summer in Baghdad. The capital seems to come to a standstill in the postprandial heat. The quayside is empty, numerous stores are closed, and the flow of automobiles is sparse.

There is only one thing the exhausting heat does not seem to affect—political life. That is understandable. August marks the 1st anniversary of the cease-fire on the Iran-Iraq front, where the conflagration of a fierce war blazed for 8 years. A little earlier, 20 July, will mark the date that the well-known UN Security Council Resolution 598 was adopted, in accordance with which peace talks are now under way between Iran and Iraq. Earlier still, 17 July, the Iraqi people will celebrate the anniversary of two revolutions—1958 and 1968—when the proimperialist regime was overthrown and the Ba'th Party proclaimed the slogan of building a socialist society in Mesopotamia.

This intermingling of diverse events has left its mark on the present-day tenor of life in Iraq, an Arab country which has recently played an ever increasing role in the entire complex of Near Eastern affairs. "We stood our ground in the war," President S. Husayn said, "we must now stand our ground in peaceful constructive labor, rectifying our mistakes in socialist building skillfully and as quickly as possible."

There are many problems. Resolving them will require not only vast financial resources but also a balanced long-term strategy which considers the specific features of the region, the features of international economic ties, and the nature of current trends in world politics. It is probably premature to say that everything has already been determined and that they are down to the small details like turning swords into plowshares and taking an optimistic view of the future. Moreover, you cannot turn a country into a modern industrial power by plowshares alone. And that is what its leaders reckon Iraq must become at the dawn of the second millennium.

First of all, the Iran question remains open. There have already been four rounds of talks under the auspices of the UN secretary general, but a way out of the deadlock has still not been found. Legalistically speaking, the sides are in a state of war. X. Perez de Cuellar reckons that settling the Iran-Iraq conflict is a "long and very complex process."

What is the essence of the problem? Right now Iran and Iraq are demanding the full implementation of the first of the 10 paragraphs of resolution 598, namely an immediate cease-fire on land, at sea, and in the air, and also both sides' withdrawal of their troops to the prewar borders. Everything seems simple. Both sides agree, both sides are willing. However, the sides interpret the terms of this paragraph in a different fashion. Iran states that following the achievement of a verbal accord on a cease-fire (20 August last year) the withdrawal of troops to internationally recognized borders must be carried out immediately. According to an official Baghdad spokesman, Iraq will be able to leave 1,000 square kilometers of Iranian territory only after Tehran stops intercepting and inspecting vessels traveling through the Straits of Hormuz and the Persian Gulf to the city of Basra and other Iraqi ports. This disagreement, which is seen in both capitals as the rival side's intention to pursue an aggressive course, is considerably complicating the implementation of a series of secondary steps linked with overall Iran-Iraq reconciliation.

Today there is probably no need to talk about an explosive situation in the Persian Gulf region. If you believe their leaders' statements the sides are fully determined to embark on an "all-embracing, permanent, and just" peace. There has been no sign of flagrant violations of the terms of the cease-fire. Political observers believe that the next round of talks between the two countries, which is now being prepared by UN special representative J. Eliasson, is designed to finally get things moving.

At the same time Paris's LE POINT magazine writes that everything is on the move in today's Iraq. No sphere has been left untouched by the mighty wind of reform blowing through the country. The incumbent Iraqi leadership only bears a vague resemblance to what it was a few years ago.

Of course, Saddam Husayn's 10-year rule has been overshadowed by the war. Western experts calculated that its consequences will be making an impact on all structures in Iraqi society for the next 10-15 years. However, a number of factors which are to some extent helping speed up Iraq's renewal are already operative. Oil prices have stabilized somewhat; oil revenues amount to 95 percent of the country's entire currency receipts. If you consider that Iraq holds third place in the world for proven stocks of this raw material (after the Soviet Union and Saudi Arabia), and if you consider the ultramodern network for its transportation onto the world market, the problem of financial backing for restoration work will in all probability be solved without particular difficulty.

In remaining a solvent country Iraq has the opportunity to recruit numerous foreign firms and companies to restore its industry and agriculture. They in turn are endeavoring not to miss out on the tidbit of Iraqi profit. A competitive struggle is under way to obtain and place advantageous orders. What is important to note here? New projects are being elaborated alongside the reconstruction processes, characterized not only by billion-dollar appropriations but also by their unusual nature, scope, and state-of-the-art technologies. From irrigation systems and gas pipelines to computer installations and most complex armaments—that is by no means the complete spectrum of current Iraqi programs.

For instance, Iraq does not hide the fact that it intends in the near future to enter into the regional military market. Its own missiles, artillery pieces, guided projectiles, reconnaissance drones, ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] systems, early-warning systems, different types of radar station, small arms, and light armored vehicles have already undergone successful tests. "We need the military industry for self-defense and also to create a base for the country's subsequent achievements," Baghdad's AL-THAWRAH wrote recently, commenting on the prospects for obtaining the technology to assemble Mirage-2000 fighters.

As for Iraq's foreign policy, its priority areas can be seen in regional aspects and above all in the attainment of unity for the Arab nation. Admittedly, the country's leadership has recently gradually abandoned the cumbersome ideas of creating a pan-Arab federation. Projects for economic integration between individual Arab countries are moving to the fore.

Iraq advocates the just solution of the Palestinian problem through the convocation of an international conference on the Near East and supports the Arab League's plan to settle the Lebanese crisis.

By virtue of a number of objective and subjective factors relations between the USSR and Iraq have been distinguished by "variable balance" over the last decade, although their overall status was regulated by the 1972 Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation. We have constructed and are constructing a great deal in this country. We have strengthened and are strengthening its defensive potential by supplying it with modern arms. At the current stage we must seek to qualitatively improve bilateral ties and establish a kind of "exemplary relations" between our two states.

Israeli Delegation Visits Soviet Union

TA2107054189 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 0400 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] The head of the Israeli delegation in Moscow, Arye Levin, says he believes that the Soviet Union is currently not interested in reestablishing diplomatic ties with Israel, even though Moscow has admitted that it made a mistake when it broke relations after the 1967 war. Levin was speaking to Israeli correspondents now visiting Moscow.

The Israeli delegation in Moscow is issuing 6,500 visas to Soviet Jews wishing to leave for Israel. The delegation has issued tourist visas to another 2,500 Soviet Jews who wish to visit Israel.

USSR Envoy-'Arafat Meeting in Tunis Reported

LD2007180389 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Tunis July 20 TASS—PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat met Gennadiy Tarasov, an aide to the Soviet foreign minister, special representative on Middle Eastern affairs, who arrived in Tunis for consultations with the Palestinian leadership.

The meeting focused on developments in the region and discussed practical steps made by the Soviet Union and the PLO in matters of Middle Eastern settlement. The need was stressed to further build up efforts to prepare and convene an international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all interested sides, including the PLO and permanent members of the UN Security Council. In particular, the two men pointed to the importance of a recent declaration on the Middle East made at the summit meeting of the European Council in Madrid.

The Soviet side reaffirmed support for the realistic and constructive line of the PLO leadership based on the decisions of the Palestine National Council, which were highly acclaimed worldwide.

Both sides spoke for continuing close mutual coordination in a search for ways of attaining regional peace.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Interview With South African Minister Cited

LD2007173189 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—South African Foreign Minister Roelof Botha has said that his country is interested in fair trade relations with all countries, including the USSR.

He made the statement in Johannesburg in an interview with a correspondent of the Soviet weekly NEW TIMES, which carried his remarks in its latest Russian-language issue.

It was the first-ever interview granted by a South African cabinet member to the Soviet mass media.

Botha said that the development of trade between South Africa and the Soviet Union will mean neither that the USSR approves of South African Government policy nor that Johannesburg approves of Mikhail Gorbachev's policy.

It will simply mean that the two countries develop contacts and trade for the benefit of their people, he explained.

Asked about ways to defuse the situation in southwestern Africa, Botha said that the region is confidently heading for peace and that South Africa is translating the U.N. General Assembly's Resolution 435 into reality.

He said that South Africa is strong enough and does not need anything from Namibia and that his country's role in southern Africa is to create essential conditions for its neighbours to develop their economies, improve living conditions, housing and medical services and create jobs and for the flourishing of the entire region.

Botha added that if Namibia joins this process, South Africa will only welcome this.

Commenting on political outlook for South Africa, he mentioned what he described as a realistic prospect of dialogue between the government and the African National Congress [ANC], though traditionally linking it with the need for the ANC to voluntarily renounce violent methods of struggle.

Aid to Mozambique National Resistance Continues

PM1907132189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Pilyatskin dispatch: "Political Solution Possible"]

[Text] Maputo—Herman Cohen, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, has attracted special attention in connection with the prospect that has emerged recently for ending armed conflict in the region.

At a press conference before leaving Maputo, H. Cohen made a statement which showed that during his meeting with Mozambican President J. Chissano the president informed him of the existing specific plan for a political settlement in Mozambique. In H. Cohen's words, if the "Mozambique National Resistance Movement" (Renamo), which is conducting hostilities against the government, responds to this plan, it will be possible to begin talks in the very near future. And to smooth the way for the peace process, the United States is prepared to act as intermediary.

The importance of this statement is that it shows the flexibility and constructiveness of the position of the Mozambican Government, which is prepared, by all accounts, to review some of its former approaches to the problem. After all, hitherto the very possibility of talks with Renamo has been rejected. On the other hand, there is an obvious desire on the part of the current U.S. Administration to play a more constructive role in the region.

The U.S. representative, who visited South Africa before Mozambique, advocated the complete ending of military support for Renamo. The South African authorities, including Army representatives, categorically deny that such support is being given at present. But the question is: What is to be done about the very vigorous activities in support of Renamo undertaken by organizations such as "Freedom Incorporated" and the "Mozambique Research Institute," whose headquarters are under the U.S. authorities' noses in Washington? I asked Mr Cohen about this.

"Organizations registered in our country," he replied, "can freely support foreign elements provided they do not break this country's laws."

[Pilyatskin] "But surely U.S. mercenaries—'soldiers of fortune'—operate within Renamo ranks, and the grouping is supplied with military equipment and arms. Isn't that a violation of U.S. laws?"

[Cohen] "I can't answer that question, I'm not a lawyer."

As we can see, even the U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs is unable to explain certain realities which clearly run counter to the trend toward easing tension in the south of the continent and establishing peace there. In a number of TV interviews in South Africa, H. Cohen noted the serious changes in the mood of that country's ruling circles in favor of talks and a settlement compared with the situation a year ago. It should be added that F. de Klerk, the new leader of the South African National Party, and Foreign Minister R. Botha are expected to visit Maputo next Wednesday [19 July] for a meeting with Mozambican President J. Chissano. It seems that the search for ways of eliminating tension in southern Africa is becoming increasingly wide-ranging.

In the context of this turn of events the words of someone who has spent 27 years in jail for striving to see his country free and democratic should be heeded. In a letter which is his first political statement since he was arrested in 1962 Nelson Mandela assesses as follows his position with regard to the discussion held in Capetown with President P. Botha: "Dialogue with the mass democratic movement, particularly the African National Congress—is the only way to end violence and to achieve peace in our country."

East Europe

Jaruzelski Meets State Council Members 20 Jul

LD2107083289 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Warsaw July 21 TASS—Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski met members of the Polish Council of State, which has now ended its term, on Thursday [20 July]. In accordance with Polish legislation, the Council of State is dissolved after a new president takes office and its functions are passed to the new president and some other bodies of state power.

Jaruzelski, who had been president of the Polish Council of State for four years, was congratulated on his election by Council of State members who also wished him persistence and success in his difficult and responsible work for the benefit of the state and the people.

During the meeting the sides emphasised that the Council of State had made a great contribution to promoting democracy and territorial self-government, and strengthening socialist legality. They also praised its support for different public and civil initiatives.

The Council of State also played a major role in creating a favourable atmosphere and conditions for the functioning of a coalition system and achieving national accord, in parliamentary activity above all, and promoting international contacts.

Jaruzelski thanked the Council of State members for their effective cooperation and active work at plenary sessions and on different commissions.

He said that positive results in the work of the Council of State had been achieved through a friendly atmosphere created by its members, their mutual understanding, initiative and activity.

Jeruzelski Faces 'Burden' as Polish President
LD2007210389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Report by "publicist" Anatoliy Druzenko from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Perhaps never before in the whole history of Poland has the election of the head of state been so dramatic. In accordance with the constitution, the president is elected by a majority of votes, 50 percent plus one vote. The tellers' commission of the National Assembly declared 537 voting papers valid. Half of this number is 269; adding one vote gives 270. it was precisely this number, 270 votes that were in favor of Wojciech Jaruzelski. One recalls the events which preceded the elections, such as Jaruzelski's refusal to stand which was a complete surprise to many people. It is difficult to assess the reasons for that decision. They can be sought in politics, in the sphere of tactics, in some sort of personal aspirations. But literally the day before the elections Wojciech Jaruzelski agreed to put forward his candidacy.

All of this—the refusal and then the agreement and finally that one single vote which determined the outcome of the elections—reflects the complicated and dramtic nature of the present situation in Poland. Nonetheless the main commentary on this event in my opinion is this: In spite of the fact that at the recent parliamentary elections the Polish United Workers Party suffered a considerable defeat, the leader of that party, nonetheless, has been elected president of the country.

What played the deciding role here? The remaining prestige of the party or the personal prestige of Wojciech Jaruzelski? I think that it is the latter. In his statement after taking the path of office, Jaruzelski said: I want to be president of accord. National accord is the credo of this politician, his credo in spite of the fact tht it was he who in December 1981 had to take probably the most dramatic decision of his political life, the introduction of martial law in the country. What curses could be heard in those days: a military coup, reaction, terror, junta. But he appealed to the people on television and said: We will stop the specter of civil war. We will not build barricades where bridges should be built. He spoke of accord even then when he headed the Military Council of National Salvation. He speaks of accord now, too, as president of the country.

In accordance with the constitution, the Polish president enjoys extensive rights. But these rights pale in the face of the burden of the tasks facing the head of state. The standard of living is dropping; there is galloping inflation; there are strikes; tension in society is increasing. From this stems Wojciech Jaruzelski's conviction that only national accord can get Poland out of its difficult situation. From the bottom of my heart I would like to wish that the activity of the president of the People's Republic, who has just been elected to this lofty post, will be accompanied by accord among the Poles.

Poland's Presidential Election Previewed
18070687 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 Jul 89 p 9

[Report by Valeriy Masterov in Warsaw: "President After President"

[Text] This formula, which explains why the president of Poland will be elected after the visit of the U.S. President to this country, was finally given by the deputy club of the PZPR [Polish United Workers Party] representing the majority in the coalition.

As we know, as one of its first acts the Polish National Assembly is to elect a head of state. Even before he had been nominated, it went without saying that W. Jaruzelski's candidacy had been accepted. But after the first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, the chairman of he Polish Council of State announced a decision he had made after deep consideration not to run for this post, a kind of "power vacuum" was created. This evoked unprecedented reaction both in the country and abroad. "If not Jaruzelski, then who?" The PZPR considers the alternative candidate, Cz. Kiszczak, internal affairs minister, one of the representatives of the line of agreement, the initiator and host, as they say, of the "roundtable," but mainly the PZPR continues to adhere to the first proposal in anticipation of W. Jaruzelski's agreement.

The challenge presented from the pages of GAZETA WYBORCZA by one of the Solidarity activists, A. Michnik—"Your president, our premier" found no support even among the leaders of this trade union association. L. Walesa, who has consistently refused the presidential post, in an interview in the aforementioned newspaper noted that "certain things are taking place beyond us, and when it comes to this issue we cannot be absolutely certain that something will not change at the last moment."

In this tense situation of anticipating the first meeting of the Sejm convened, and then there was also a meeting of the Senate, which now represent a bicameral parliament. It was strange to see members of the government headed

by the premier not in the deputy seats but in guest seats next to the people from the press. The results of the elections led to a completely different alignment of political forces. In parliament neither the coalition nor the opposition has an unquestioned majority, and this means that there must be mutual understanding, which was also declared by representatives of various groups.

It is clear that the work of the Polish parliament will be labor-intensive and will require parliamentary mutual respect. Even at the first meetings they raised questions which could not even have been discussed previously. For example, about alternative candidacies for the high position of marshal of the Sejm. Or the request to the internal affairs minister concerning holding back demonstrators who were protesting against candidates for president. The refusal to dismiss the government, which had to account for 9 months' activity, was also unexpected.

This question evoked an especially sharp reaction. The continuous, ever accelerating growth of prices (this semester for the first time it almost reached the 100-percent mark), waiting lines in stores, the lack of meat, and the fact that there were not even any potatoes—all this could cause another outburst of dissatisfaction which could tear the fabric of the roundtable agreements. As we can see, patience is becoming the commodity in shortest supply on the domestic market.

The first joint meeting of the Sejm and the Senate was held on 10 July and coincided with the visit of the U.S. President to Poland. G. Bush's speech in the Polish parliament was one of the central events of the program for its session.

Zaykov Attends Meeting Lauding Poland's 'Rebirth'

LD2007212889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] A festive meeting on 20 July in Moscow was devoted to the 45th anniversary of the rebirth of Poland. In the speeches it was noted that the creation of the people's state embodied the age-old hopes and desires of Polish democrats and patriots. With the emergence of a people's Poland, the foundation of a fundamental turning point in Soviet-Polish relations was laid, to which the present processes of restructuring and renewal have given a new quality. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the meeting.

Correspondent Examines Romania's Economy

PM2107102389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Volodin dispatch: "Romania: After Payment of Debts"]

[Text] Bucharest—Addressing a recent Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee Political Executive Committee session, N. Ceausescu sharply criticized the petroleum extraction and mining industries, metallurgy, and the chemical industry for serious laggardness in fulfilling plan targets. The RCP general secretary pointed to the desire of production associations to make up for the shortfall in the planned material production volumes by producing more expensive goods; to the uneconomic utilization of energy resources and raw materials; to the failure of the republic's industry to fulfill more than 50 percent of its export obligations.

So, just as happened 1, 2, or 3 years ago, impartial criticism has once again been leveled at Romanian industry. One cause of the irregularities in the economy is undoubtedly the tremendous effort aimed at eliminating the foreign debts in freely convertible currency. Romania is one of the few countries in the modern world that has managed to pay off its debts. But the inordinate intensity of export plans has left its mark. The internal market has suffered from a shortfall of acutely essential output.

The country resembled a heavily laden boat. With its engine straining, the boat-country followed a rocky course until what was presumed to be the main rapids were left astern—the payment of its $21 billion foreign debt (including interest).

Indeed, once the debts were eliminated trade in the state stores became brisker and peasant markets began operating more actively. A number of legislative acts adopted in Romania also inspired hope of rapid changes. Thus in April a State Council decision canceled the debts of more than 3,700 agricultural production cooperatives to the tune of 113 billion lei. Wage rates and pensions were raised for agricultural workers. A decision was adopted to increase by 40 percent payment in kind in grain by peasant farms.

However, subsequent months have shown that a real improvement in things is still a long way off. The extremely tough limits on the expenditure of energy carriers in the domestic and industrial sectors remain unchanged. The lines of vehicles at the gas pumps have not become shorter. Sales of sugar and vegetable oil are still rationed. Long lines form early in the morning for goods such as meat, cheese, flour, and butter. The quality of many consumer goods leaves something to be desired, and the best-quality products are still being exported.

Of course, the export thrust of the economy has enabled Romania to strengthen its positions on the world market and to broaden the geography of deliveries of certain types of machinery, equipment, furniture, light industry output, and petroleum-refining products. Romania occupies one of the first places in the world as a manufacturer and exporter of petroleum-drilling and refining equipment. But still, in my view, the desire to pay off the foreign debt as quickly as possible has been one of the causes of the unrhythmic nature of the Romanian economic mechanism. The chronic failures to meet plan targets are also a consequence of its "overheating."

Work under extreme conditions and the unprecedented increase in exports, in parallel with involvement in large-scale internal development programs and in grandiose construction projects, have accelerated the physical wear and tear on production fixed capital, placing on the agenda the question of the radical renewal of the means of production. How will this task be resolved under conditions of the proclaimed refusal to obtain new credits from the West?

It cannot be ruled out that some modern technologies and equipment will nonetheless be purchased abroad. But, as it was explained to me at the Romanian State Committee for Planning, the means of production will mainly be modernized by replacing obsolete equipment, including imported equipment, with modern Romanian analogues. Moreover, it is not a question of simply replacing certain machines with others but of creating in Romania a fundamentally new mechanism capable of successfully resolving such problems as the profitability, efficiency, quality, and competitiveness of Romanian output on the basis of employing high-technology processes.

It is proposed that production of industrial output will increase 30-40 percent during the period 1991 through 1995 thanks to the introduction of progressive technologies. At the same time, in terms of quality, by the end of the 5-year plan Romanian products are not only to correspond to but also to exceed world standards in terms of certain parameters. There is no denying that this is an extremely difficult task.

The recently published draft directive program of the 14th RCP Congress provides for Romania's active participation in production, scientific, and technical cooperation with the CEMA countries, other socialist countries, and also all states of the world. The program has the long-term view of doubling national income while maintaining a very high proportion of accumulation (28-30 percent). The share of exports is to exceed 30 percent of marketable products. The realization of such a large-scale program will undoubtedly require a new mobilization of all the country's forces and resources.

West Europe

USSR Reaches Consulate Agreement With FRG

LD2007143689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1414 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow, 20 July (TASS)—In accordance with protocols signed by the foreign ministries of the USSR and the FRG on 22 July 1986 and 19 January 1988 on setting up general consulates of the USSR in Munich and of the FRG in Kiev, an accord has been reached on opening them at the end of July.

Gorbachev Greets Greek Party General Secretary

LD2007210189 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev cordially congratulated Grigorios Farakos, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece, on the occasion of his election to this post.

The telegram sent to Farakos wishes him fruitful work for the benefit of peace, democracy and social progress.

Gorbachev expressed confidence that relations between the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of Greece would continue to develop in the spirit of fraternal friendship and cooperation.

Relations Between Greeks, Turks on Cyprus Viewed

18070694 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Jul 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by A. Nikolayev and A. Ostalskiy, IZVESTIYA special correspondents, Nicosia: "Two Halves of a Whole; Hopes and Sorrows of Divided Cyprus"]

[Text] The village of Pila in southeast Cyprus is most likely the only place of its kind on earth. There is no authority here, no police, and no customs—only a wooden platform with the inscription "UN" rises above the main square. It was empty almost all of the time that we were strolling around Pila, and then suddenly a soldier in a blue steel helmet appeared and yelled to us: "Hey, taking pictures in Pila is prohibited." And then he immediately disappeared. And we, frankly, took all of the pictures we wanted.

A lot of things here are amazing. For example, a huge figure of a soldier looms over Pila that is either carved out of wood or some other material, and it intimidates, warns, and reminds. About what? Of course, about the fact that the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" (TRNC) starts on the other side of the mountain, occupying about one-third of the territory of the island and recognized by only one state in the world—by Turkey, of course. Soldiers of this country are on guard duty day and night on the mountain overlooking Pila, vigilantly guarding the "state border," which the Greek Cypriots do not recognize as such, calling it a "dividing line." However, it is easier to cross this line in Pila than in other places, at least for one part of the population of the village.

The fact is that it is the only settlement with a mixed Greek-Turkish population that is left on the island since the events of 1974 (the population was larger at one time). One tiny Turkish community lives in the little village of (Potamya), near Nicosia, with its own village headman. And so, it is only here in Pila that Cypriot Greeks and Cypriot Turks now live next to each other.

But the Turkish part of the population moves freely back and forth across a border that is not accessible for the Greeks.

It may be particularly surprising that the representatives of the two quarreling communities live here absolutely peacefully, side by side, house by house, and fence by fence. There are no murders or even serious fights on national grounds. And this is on an island that has been split for many years by a sharp inter-communal conflict! It is more than a riddle. Perhaps it is also a lesson.

The unusual life of Pila is defined by its special status, which developed as a result of the armistice that was reached almost 15 years ago. Neither side is allowed to have troops here, nor armed police, nor organs of authority. Pila is in a buffer zone, in a "no man's land."

But in other places, the dividing line (the so-called "green line") is a lot gloomier. Areas that are adjacent to Nicosia strike one as being especially unpleasant. Here is a house that is abandoned, gloomy, with windows that are nailed tight—still the Republic of Cyprus, and that one, the next one, either at least its far half, is obviously "an illegally occupied part" of the island (according to official terminology used in the south), or it is the TRNC—"Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" (as they will tell you in the north).

A reminder—Cyprus is an island in the eastern Mediterranean Sea with an area of 9,251 square kilometers and a population of approximately 700,000 persons, of which about 80 percent are Greeks and the remainder, Turks. The country received its independence in 1960, but sharp frictions between the two communities began to be felt almost immediately. The conflict reached its high point in 1974 when Greek Cypriot nationalists from the extremist organization "EOKA-2" [National Organization of Cypriot Fighters], with the support of the "black colonels" who ruled in Greece, attempted a state coup and immediately afterwards Turkish troops landed in the north of the island on the pretext of protecting Cypriot Turks. The mutiny was quickly put down, but Turkish soldiers remain on Cyprus to this day.

A separate state formation was set up on the territory they occupy in February of 1975, and 8 years later it received the current designation—TRNC.

Since that time the international community undertook quite a few efforts to preserve the territorial integrity of Cyprus, and to find a peaceful solution to the problem that was acceptable to both communities. The Soviet Union, whose position on a Cyprus settlement is well-known, also participated in these efforts: We are for a sovereign , independent, and united Cyprus, and for the withdrawal of foreign troops from its territory. However, up until now, all of these efforts have ended without results. It is only now, after the regular meeting of the leaders of both Cyprus communities with the secretary general of the UN in New York, that there seems to be a ray of hope....

A sign states in Greek: "Our border does not cross here!" But it was more difficult for us to cross the "green line" than any other border recognized by everyone—so much coordination and so many decisions were needed for this. You see, authorities on the northern side try to put a notation in your passport that you have visited the TRNC, but you are not allowed to return to the Greek side with such a notation.

Here is a typical detail: It is almost impossible to make a telephone call from one part of the island to the other, as if Cypriot Greeks and Cypriot Turks did not live 20 meters from each other, but on different planets....

And Yeoryios Vasiliou, the president of the Republic of Cyprus, and Rauf Denktash (in the north of the island he is called the president of TRNC) agree with the necessity for a quick resolution of the Cypriot problem. Then why are there no results from the long and arduous negotiations of the representatives of both communities that are being held under the aegis of the secretary general of the United Nations? Apparently, there is still a snag not only in the different view of how to achieve this objective. It seems that the settlement itself and its sense and substance are understood differently by the parties.

In the words of Y. Vasiliou, the Cypriot Government is for the creation of a federated republic on Cyprus, where territorial regions (provinces) would exist—Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot with their own self-government. In doing this, the corresponding community would constitute the majority in each of the areas, and it would have the full right to its own system of education, the preservation of its cultural heritage, and even the establishment of its own security organs and the maintenance of order, and so forth.

"We want to see a new Cyprus—a federated one, but united, with guaranteed rights and freedoms for both communities," the president emphasized.

As for R. Denktash, he gives special attention to the "question of recognition" to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

"When we come into a negotiations room, he stops being President Vasiliou, and I, President Denktash. We are leaders of both communities. But just as soon as you leave the room, they start to treat the Greek side as the government, and us, as only a community. Therefore, the problem of Cyprus has not been resolved up to the present time," R. Denktash says.

But why does he react negatively to the well-known Soviet proposal about convening an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations to resolve the foreign aspects of the Cyprus problem (including the

not unimportant question of international borders)? It appears that it is all a matter of "recognition."

"If we agree to an international conference in which Greek Cypriots will participate as the government, and we—only as a 'community,' we will not be able to deliberate a full agreement. Why go to a conference without the hope of success?"—this is the point of view of the leader of the Turkish community on Cyprus. "To find a formula so that they would treat us as equals," he adds.

In meeting with the leaders of the main political parties of the Republic of Cyprus, we became convinced that, with slight nuances—from those on the right to Communists—they all support the position of President Y. Vasiliou. Speaking about the reasons for differences between the sides in inter-communal negotiations, they practically unanimously announced that the essence of the difficulties lies in the position of Turkey and the excessive dependence of the leaders of the Turkish Cypriot community on it. Glafkos Kliridis, chairman of the Democratic Assembly party, says about them: "These people do not have much freedom." Spiros Kiprianou, former president of Cyprus and leader of the Democratic Party, was even more categorical: "Serious progress in settlement cannot be reached until Ankara's position changes, and, it seems, new immigrants are more important to it than the fate of Cyprus and Turkish Cypriots.

Actually, this question—what to do with people who came to Cyprus from Turkey in the last 15 years—is extremely critical. In the words of R. Denktash, there are now about 17-20,000 immigrants. But in the south of Cyprus, we had occasion to hear another figure—60,000. In any case, their fate is both a political problem and a human tragedy. Vassos Lissaridis, the chairman of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus and leader of the socialist party EDIK [Democratic Center Union], speaks about this very emotionally: "Now, very likely, these people could still be returned to their homeland, but what will happen when a new generation comes up that was born on Cyprus, what is to be done with them? And a Cyprus settlement is impossible without a resolution of the immigration problem, and no compromises here are acceptable to us."

Incidentally, we got the impression that this question also alarms the Turkish Cypriots. The stream of immigrants is noticeably increasing the social tension in the north of the island, and the fight for jobs is becoming more intense. "If a settlement is not reached in the very near future," said a store owner in Kyrenia, a city where advanced detachments of Turkish troops landed in 1974, "then Turkish Cypriots will stop being masters here." People on the streets of Lefkoshi (this is what Nicosia is called in Turkish) and Kyrenia eagerly engage in conversations, talk about the dominance of the mafia, shady transactions with credits, about smuggling the importation of manpower from Turkey—you see, practically nothing is paid to construction workers, unskilled laborers, and seasonal workers who come to pick citrus fruit. But they are happy even with this and are prepared to work 8 and 12 hours a day, they get no social insurance, and they do not participate in trade unions. All of this troubles Turkish Cypriots greatly. Although, of course, there are a few who "struck a vein" and are getting rich on smuggling or on the exploitation of cheap manpower. People like this, of course, are completely satisfied with the existing situation. But the majority, it seemed to us, still sincerely would like a peaceful unification of Cyprus, true, with differently understood legal rights and interests of the Turkish community. But they are ready to agree with the principle of peaceful settlement itself. Differences begin over such things, for example, as the demand of the other side to withdraw Turkish troops from Cypriot land or to ensure freedom of selection of places of residence and ownership of property for all Cypriots. Some of the people we talked to "from the north" see in this an encroachment on the interests of the Turkish community. They object to a return to the former situation, which means, in their opinion, the economic and cultural inequality of both communities. "They (that is, the leaders of the Greek community) would like everything to become as it was before; that they would be in their own homes and we—in the fields!"—is the way the position was described by a journalist from the north. We do not intend to judge what part of truth there is in this assertion, but similar views are rather widely held in the north of Cyprus and this, apparently, has to be taken into account one way or the other.

As time passes, the lack of a settlement of the Cyprus problem will inevitably lead to a growth in distrust and nationalist and extremist attitudes. Many in Cyprus spoke to us about this fear, including Dimitrius Christofias, the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Restorative Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL). The bearers of nationalist ideas are conducting their propaganda, and they are persuading the people that it will not be possible by peaceful means to compel the Turkish Cypriots to make concessions. They are pushing people toward thoughts of entirely different ways of struggle, about force and terror, and they are heating up chauvinist attitudes. The picture is familiar to us from many areas of the world where sources of tension and national-religious conflicts exist.... In a temper, President Y. Vasiliou even called the situation that has developed a policy of splitting the country with a unique "apartheid." T. Akkor, a Turkish Cypriot and leader of the school teachers trade union, also warns about the danger of chauvinism. Whose chauvinism does he have in mind? "One and the other," he answers. "We must urgently review the school program, to introduce new textbooks, and to begin to teach each other's language. In 15 years of total isolation, a whole generation has already grown up that does not know anything about its contemporaries from the other community. This is why the Cypriot problem has to be resolved now and not 10 years from now. But that will be too late."

"But that will be too late." This expression rang like a refrain in almost all of our conversations. It was sounded by various people—from a hotel owner and a policeman

to the president. The latter noted with bitterness the contrast between the general tendency in the resolution of regional conflicts in the world and the dead end in the resolution of the Cyprus problem. "The fact that in the new international climate the Cyprus problem remains 'shelved' in the past looks like an absurd and incongruous anachronism," said Y. Vasiliou.

These words, true, were said before the last meeting in New York which, according to reports of the news agencies, noted (knock on wood!) "some progress." But skeptical voices can already be heard....

"But that will be too late." We recalled these words, looking at positions along the cease fire line established 15 years ago, and we note that the bags here and there are already overgrown with grass. And weeds are growing in the "buffer zone" and in the neutral strip. And will the Cyprus problem itself, not finding its solution, really become overgrown with the "weed of oblivion." Will the island really become united only on physical maps, but the two parts of one country will be split by an insurmountable barrier? We and those who are not indifferent to the fate of Cyprus do not want to believe this.

USSR-Spanish Consultations Held in Moscow

LD2007185789 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—Soviet-Spanish consultations on matters concerning security, disarmament, and U.N. activities were held at the Soviet Foreign Ministry on July 19-20 during meetings with Juan Manuel Cabrera, general director of the International Organisations Board of the Spanish Foreign Ministry, and Jose Cuenca, the Spanish ambassador in Moscow.

The Spanish representatives were received by Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR. Mutual striving to establish closer interaction of the two countries in matters concerning U.N. activities and enhancement of the U.N. role in ensuring universal security was expressed during the conversations.

USSR Holds Talks With EC Delegation on Trade

LD2007172189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1503 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Brussels, 20 July. TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov reports:

On 19-20 July at the European Community headquarters, the first round of official talks on concluding an agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the Economic Community and the Soviet Union was held. Heading the Soviet delegation was I.D. Ivanov, deputy chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers. Heading the European Community Commission delegation was H. Krenzler, the general director of the chief directorate for foreign ties of the European Community commission.

During the first round, the delegations laid out their points of view on the structure and content of a future agreement. Note was made of both sides' efforts to reach a wide-scale agreement which will embrace not only questions of trade, but also such spheres as industrial cooperation, investments, science and technology, and measures to promote commercial activity. Accord was achieved on cooperation between Soviet ministries and departments and corresponding sub-divisions of the European Community commission in sectors which are of mutual interest and on which the competence of the European Community falls. Among these are power engineering, nuclear power engineering, agriculture, standardization, environmental protection, transport, fishing, and information. Working out the concrete formulas of an agreement will begin in the second round of talks, planned for this October.

The head of the Soviet delegation told a TASS correspondent that the start of talks opens up a new stage in the development of relations betwen the Soviet Union and the European Community. The first discussion of a future agreement—the broadest which has ever been entered into with the "Common Market"—shows that its representatives have positively perceived the majority of proposals put forward by the Soviet Union and that on many problems the viewpoints of both sides coincide. Of course at such complicated talks it is not possible to agree immediately on everything. There remains a whole series of important questions on which we occupy different positions. They will require in-depth study and a persistent search for ways to bring them closer. Both delegations, he noted, view the opening of official talks as a contribution to the all-European process.

Latin America & Caribbean

USSR Greets Nicaraguan Leaders on Anniversary

PM2007140989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR leading bodies' greetings to Nicaragua's leaders on the 10th anniversary of the Sandinist revolution]

[Text] To Comrade Daniel Ortega Saavedra, president of the Republic of Nicaragua
To the National Assembly of the Republic of Nicaragua
To the National Leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN]

On this momentous date—the 10th anniversary of the victory of the Sandinist people's revolution—we send you and all the friendly people of the Republic of Nicaragua our cordial greetings and sincere congratulations.

A difficult but glorious path has been traveled in a historically short period of time. In conditions of economic blockade and outside interference, the Nicaraguan people, rallying around the FSLN, defeated the armed counterrevolution and defended their country's

independence and sovereignty and their right to independently choose their path of development.

The Sandinist national-democratic revolution is now entering a qualitatively new, peaceful stage. Showing political courage and farsightedness, the leadership of the Republic of Nicaragua and the FSLN is consistently pursuing a course of switching from confrontation to dialogue and of achieving democratization and national reconciliation and is seeking ways to solve the country's serious socioeconomic problems. The principles of political pluralism, a mixed economy, and nonalignment proclaimed by the Sandinist revolution are being put into practice.

Nicaragua's enterprising, flexible foreign policy line has won deserved recognition and respect from the world community. This line has contributed in many respects to the easing of tension in the region, the achievement of the Guatemala and El Salvador accords, and in general the current positive progress in the task of reaching a Central American settlement.

The Soviet Union will continue to develop relations of friendship and multifaceted cooperation with the Republic of Nicaragua and strengthen solidarity with the Nicaraguan people, who want to live and work in conditions of peace and freedom.

We wish you and all Nicaraguans success on the path of national accord, progress, and prosperity.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

Nicaragua's Economic, Political Problems Viewed

PM2007121989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 5

[M. Kryuchkov dispatch: "So Much Feeling for the Motherland. Today Is the 10th Anniversary of the Sandinist Revolution"]

[Excerpts] Managua—[passage omitted] If the Portuguese revolution was described at the time as a "revolution of carnations," the Nicaraguan revolution could be described as the "revolution of smiles." I first came to Managua in the summer of 1980, shortly after the celebrations of the first anniversary of the Sandinistas' victory. Most Nicaraguans were in a festive mood even when the festivities were over. [passage omitted]

Now the euphoria of the early eighties is remembered with a sad smile and people try not to look too far into the distant bright future—present concerns weigh too heavily. Not many can boast that their monthly wages exceed 1 million cordobas, although that is a mere $40. So that being a millionaire in Nicaragua if you have a decent job is not difficult, but feeding a family with that million is another matter. By our Soviet standards the stores are overflowing with goods and comestibles, but the customers in front of the stalls offering intoxicatingly aromatic delicacies and bright, fashionable clothes are few and far between. Even rich foreigners are put off by the prices, and the sales assistants in the endlessly long galleries of stores and stalls in the capital's trade center mostly have nothing to do and are bored. Having dinner in a restaurant can mean sitting in proud isolation all evening under the watchful eyes of a dozen waiters, languishing in expectation of customers. Most Nicaraguans are forced, despite the availability of a good dozen different kinds of meat, to give preference to a vegetarian diet of rice, beans, corn, and cheap vegetables—which is all that the family budget can take.

Life is hard. Who, what country, what people was ever made happy by a war?

The government is actively seeking ways of reviving the economy, stimulating exports in order to replenish the coffers with foreign currency, and lowering taxes to provide incentives for industrialists to expand production. However, despite all this it has so far been possible only to slow down the development of the crisis, not to end it. Social programs have had to be sacrificed to it, but there is no other way: The economy has the habit of backfiring when its laws are violated. People in Nicaragua have had to learn this from their own experience.

The sociopolitical situation is very difficult and is further complicated by the elections scheduled for February next year. The election campaign has officially not yet started but the contest for votes is already in full swing. In the country with a population of 3 million, there are 21 officially registered parties of which 14 (from the extreme right to the extreme left) have united in the National Opposition Alliance. They have united on a single common platform—the categorical rejection of Sandinism.

This will hardly be sufficient for victory and, furthermore, before the elections the alliance will have to take the major hurdle of agreeing on the nomination of candidates, which will probably not pass without losses. Furthermore, while brutally attacking the Sandinistas, the opposition has so far failed to put forward any sort of constructive program and the majority of Nicaraguans are not likely to support destructive slogans.

This confident forecast is based on the incontrovertible fact that no political, social, or economic scheme in present-day Nicaragua is possible without the Sandinistas. Among the opposition leaders there are quite a few brilliant, intelligent, and clever people. However, for the majority of Nicaraguans they are unknown people, judging the country's problems from the sidelines, as it were, having not lived in the country through the last 10 years of hope and disillusionment, overflowing joy and great grief; people who have not had to bury young boys who put on military uniform in order to defend their revolution; people who have not had to ask themselves the eternal question of how to survive until the next payday.

Even if it is assumed that they genuinely want what is good for the people, the people do not entirely trust them. The Sandinistas with all their mistakes and miscalculations and past and future shortcomings are for most Nicaraguans people whom they regard as their own, and the revolution—no matter how difficult a stage it may be going through—is their own revolution. [passage omitted]

Political & Social

Further on Miners Strikes; Some Settled

Kuzbass Workers Resume Work 21 Jul

LD2107064489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] After a 10-dzay strike, the situation in the Kuzbass has completely returned to normal. This morning all the mines and enterprises resumed their work, which had come to standstill with the permission of the strike committees. The unloading of coal, which had accumulated on spur tracks, has started to go ahead in full swing. At a number of mines the previous volume of output has resumed. Preparatory work is being completed at other mines.

The government commission that is in the oblast headed by Slyunkov, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met yesterday with the working people of the towns of Belovo, Guryevsk, and Salair. Early this morning the members of the commission set out for Mezhdurechensk.

Agreement Reached on Some Demands

LD2107103489 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS—Soviet Coal Minister Mikhail Shchadov today passed for publication a list of demands on which agreement was reached between the strike committee of the Kuznetsk coal basin and the special CPSU Central Committee, government and trade union council commission, which is working in the Kuznetsk basin. These decisions apply in equal measure to all coal-mining regions of the Soviet Union.

Miners of the Kuznetsk coal basin in southern Siberia went on strike on July 10, putting forward a variety of economic demands. They have now returned to work. Similar demands were put forward by striking miners of the Donets basin (Ukraine), Karaganda (Kazakhstan), Rostov on Don (southern Russian) and Vorkuta (northern Russia).

The document says that the mines and pits will receive full economic and legal autonomy, while the existing production amalgamations with their top-heavy management structure will be replaced by associations or other voluntary forms of organising coal mining. From August 1, 1989, the mines and other enterprises of the coal-mining complex will gain the right to sell for negotiated prices in the USSR and abroad, products which they make over and above the state plan. From the same day the coal mining businesses will have the right to set their own norms of production, pay rates and some other indices.

From July 1, 1989, wages increase by 40 per cent for miners working night shifts and by 20 per cent for those working evening shifts. Sunday will be a general day off work for them.

The coal mining businesses will now be able to give lump-sum grants to the families of miners who die in accidents and to retiring veterans, and child-care leave of up to three years to working mothers.

Agreement has been also reached on some other points which apply to the miners' pension scheme.

Mixed Reaction to Agreement

PM2007124589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Second Edition p 8

[Own correspondent A. Bogachuk report: "Difficult Time for the Kuzbass"]

[Excerpts] Kemerovo Oblast, 19 Jul—PRAVDA has already reported yesterday that, following the first joint session of the government commission and the joint strike committee, which examined and satisfied a number of the strikers' demands, the joint strike committee has instructed city strike committees to resume work at enterprises.

People in the mining towns reacted in different ways to this instruction. In the south of the Kuzbass, where M. Shchadov, USSR minister of the coal industry; F. Tabeyev, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers; and A. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo CPSU Oblast Committee, had repeatedly met with miners over the past few days, many collectives at mines and open cuts were already well-disposed toward going back to work. [passage omitted]

Probably the Prokopyevsk strike committee found it hardest of all to end the strike and go back to work. Ecological problems there are the most acute, lags have been permitted in the development of the social sphere, and the government resolution on the long-term development of Prokopyevsk and the neighboring town of Kiselevsk have not even been half fulfilled. And yet the Prokopyevsk people believed in the reality and unconditional fulfillment of the decisions jointly made in their city by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Council of Ministers commission, and the Kuzbass miners' joint strike committee.

But in most mining towns the situation remains very tense.

This morning IZVESTIYA correspondent P. Voroshilov and I visited certain enterprises at the Kemerovo Mine. In conversations with the miners and economic leaders it transpired that many of them would like to go back to work, but this prompts sharp censure from the strike committee at the oblast center. We only had to enter the

premises where it has set itself up to hear one strike committee member warn the enterprise director over the phone:

"Stop work immediately or the entire rostrum in the square will be plastered with leaflets branding you as scabs!"

During the week of the strike the country's metallurgical plants have suffered delivery shortfalls of more than 200,000 tonnes of coke, including more than 50,000 tonnes at the Magnitogorsk combine. The material loss at the industrial enterprises of the Kuzbass alone already totals R48 million. [passage omitted]

Some Miners To Continue Strike

PM2007112489 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Special correspondents P. Voroshikov, A. Solovyev report: "Kuzbass: Joint Protocol Signed"]

[Text] The government commission and the oblast strike committee are working around the clock: Time presses. The majority of the miners' demands concerning the Kuzbass and the entire coal mining sector have been examined, in the main, and exhaustive decisions adopted. A joint protocol has been signed, the text of which has been published in the local press and broadcast on radio and television.

Many mining collectives acknowledge that the dialogue is moving in the right direction, constructive measures are being outlined, and the principles of democracy and glasnost are being observed. Therefore the strike committees in Propokpyevsk, Kovokuznetsk, Osinniki, and Myski decided to stop the strike. Coal shipments have begun here. The Mezhdurechensk miners are markedly stepping up coal extraction.

The stabilization of the situation in these cities was promoted by the fact that the strike committees here are in control of the situation, they heed the opinion of the enterprise collectives and do not yield to the provocations of extremist groupings whose envoys have hurried to the Kuzbass from the most remote regions and are trying not only to join the movement, but to take it over and dictate their will. In Novokuznetsk, for instance, they have renounced the rally method of resolving the miners' problems, and contentious issues are submitted for discussion at workers' meetings. The city committee acts as a coordinating center and avoids diktat. No one forced the "Bungurskaya" and "Dmitrov" mines and the Listvyanskiy and Baydayevskiy opencut mines to resume work; they themselves voted for it.

In some cities work has not yet resumed. Here the strike committees deemed it possible not to support the recommendation of the oblast strike committee to stop the strike for the duration of the talks with the government commission. They say: "We are acting on democratic principles..."

Together with PRAVDA's own correspondent A. Bogachuk, we visited Kemerovo's coal enterprises and talked with leaders and workers. Many want to go back to work and claim that the continuation of the strike could reduce the pits to a dangerous condition, but they are not allowed to go down to the face. No doubt in such cases the right to decide should belong to the collective, diktat is inappropriate.

At the Kedrovskiy opencut there is 300,000 tonnes of coal in the stockpile. It is already giving off smoke. Empty freightcars are building up on the sidings. The railroad workers are being presented with the bill for the freightcars' idle time. So who but the collective should make the decision to resume work?

During the strike the total losses in industry in Kemerovo Oblast amounted to R48 million. The coal enterprises have already lost R26.6 million of profit. R3.7 million will have to be paid in fines alone, for late delivery of coal.

The demands of some of the strike committees look odd: "We will return to work when the government commission comes to our city." There are 10 mining cities in the Kuzbass. The commission will have to spend at least 2 days in each of them. So is each one going to wait its turn and lose days or even weeks?

A new stage is beginning in the government commission's work; a very complex and crucial state requiring effort and time in order to study regional problems in detail and take decisions. The sooner the explosion of emotion gives way to reason, the more successfully the work could be completed.

On 19 July the Kemerovo strike committee made the decision to stop the strike.

Work Resumes in Kemerovo 20 Jul

LD2007180289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent reports from Kemerovo:

[A. Konstantinov] Today strike action was concluded at almost all the enterprises of the Kuzbass; and, since the night shift, coal has been going up. Strike action is continuing only at a few mines in Kiselevsk where the miners are not satisfied with the agreement of the oblast strike committee and the government commission. Work also commenced at the Chernigovskiy mine, one of the biggest opencast coal mines in Kemerovo Oblast. [video shows work under way at the Chernigovskiy opencast mine]

[V. Zabolotnov, mine director] It has been a full working day today. Some miners went down last night and the rest got down this morning in accordance with the decision of the strike committee.

[Konstantinov] And so the strike is finished. And one of its lessons is that it revealed the total incapability of many trade union functionaries and their total isolation from the workers. Here at the Chernigovskiy opencast mine we saw an announcement: the strikers have expressed no confidence in the trade union committee due to its passive position on life. For this reason, an emergency meeting is being called. The committee adopted a no-confidence decision in the trade union committee for being inactive during the strike.

[Zabolotnov] I think that this applies not only to our trade union committee but also to our oblast trade union organizations. I mean that the trade unions have separated themselves from the people and that they are not living according to the needs of the people, because they were not prepared and did not know about the strike. And even the behaviour of the leaders of some of our trade unions is indicative of this. If the leaders of enterprises got involved with the strikers... [changes thought] in some places they supported them and in others not, but they were alongside them. Solovyev, chairman of the (?central executive) committee [of the trade unions], did not appear at all. He was on leave when everybody was busy with the strike.

[Konstantinov] He was vacationing at a holiday facility somewhere.

[Zabolotnov] Yes. It is said that he was at the [word indistinct] sanatorioum throughout. In any event, I do not know of him getting involved in the work anywhere.

[Konstantinov] What have the workers gained as a result of the strike? It is impossible to enumerate all 35 points of the agreement. But I would like to dwell on some points individually. First, as an exception, the participants in the strike will be paid according to the standard rate for the entire strike period. Observance of the labor rights of members of the strike committees and of the strikers are guaranteed. Any possibility of encroachment upon their rights either during the strike or after its conclusion is ruled out. Particularly for the Kuzbass, the supplies of foodstuffs will be improved and the regional benefits [poyasnoy koeffitsient] and some other privileges will be increased. However, the strike did not only pursue a local purpose so to speak. Notably, from 1 July this year, payment for the night and evening shifts for the workers of the entire coal industry was increased by 40 pecent and 20 percent according to the standard rate. For this purpose, the Coal Industry Ministry is allocating some R7 million. The State Committee on Prices and the Coal Industry Ministry were instructed to examine a reform in the wholesale prices of coal. A significant number of the strikers' proposals will be registered in the draft law on pensions, annual leave, and others which are being prepared.

One particular question is what will the strike committees do now? On the one hand, they have fulfilled their mission and it seems that they can return to their work places. On the other hand, these people proved capable of ruling the working masses at a responsible moment, capable of soundly organizing them and of skillfully leading all their actions without allowing any extremist outbursts or any instances of drunkenness or of anti-Soviet speeches. Moreover, the fulfillment of the agreements must be monitored on both sides: by the government commission and by empowered members of the strike committee. [video shows opencast mining scenes, before proceeding to show members of the strike committee at work in an office]

[Muzhivitin, member of the oblast strike committee] Generally, this strike has shown who is who. And there are good fellows among our collective, too. I think that people's deputy elections to rayon, city, and oblast committees either immediately or in the fall are needed for local soviet power to really exist. And then we will see who is who. And the people ought to understand that if they elect people who are decent and principled, then things will get done and there will be real soviet power.

Kuzbass Update for 19 Jul

PM2107073989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Second Edition p 2

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA-TASS report under the rubric "Miners' Strike Subsiding": "Difficult Road to Dialogue"]

[Text] Kemerovo Oblast—Let us recall that on Tuesday the oblast strike committee recommended that the Kuzbass municipal committees call a halt to the strike as of the third shift that day—18 July. But it became known during the night of 19 July that not everyone supported the decision.

N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met journalists in Prokopyevsk on Tuesday evening. He shared his impressions of the joint work carried out by the government commission and the strike committee.

"We worked yesterday until 0400 hours, went through nine points of the demands, and found coordinated solutions to all of them. The discussion is proceeding in a constructive manner."

It must be stressed once again that the strike was brought about by the social neglect of the entire Kuzbass. It was not only out of solidarity with the miners that many collectives in other sectors stopped work and submitted their own demands (they are for the most part similar). There are whole or partial strikes, for instance at the

Belovo "Kuzbassradio" plant, the Leninsk-Kuznetsk worsted cloth combine, the Kiselev furniture factory, the "Kuzbassobuv" Association, and the "Elektromashina," "Prodmash," and bearing plants in Prokopyevsk.

But there are some preliminary results of the last few days—10 through 18 July. Some 999,000 man-days of work time have been lost. The damage has been determined at R48 million. Coal extraction in the Kuzbass is proceeding with a shortfall of 1,887,000 tonnes. The strikers are well aware of these figures. Understanding of the situation is increasing slowly and gradually. In the last 24 hours several enterprises have resumed work.

Whereas according to data for 18 July approximately 180,000 people were on strike at more than 160 enterprises, by the morning of 19 July, at a meeting of the oblast party-economic aktiv in Novokuznetsk, oblast party committee first secretary A. Melnikov was citing the following figures: approximately 150,000 strikers at 133 enterprises. This if, of course, alarming information, but it is reassuring in comparison with previous figures....

Speaking at the meeting of the party-economic aktiv, N.N. Slyunkov familiarized its participants with the protocol signed 2 hours earlier of measures agreed between the oblast strike committee and the government commission. It points out that the socioeconomic position had deteriorated in the oblast as a result of the protracted lag in the development of the social sphere. This was the result of diktat and tyranny on the part of ministries and departments and permissiveness on the part of local party and soviet organs. Our newspaper has already reported the substance of some of the agreements that have been reached: the granting of independence to enterprises, and the establishment of an increased area wage rate for the oblast's working people as of 1 August.

When the content of the agreements was announced on the radio in the cities of the Kuzbass, many miners began to return from the squares to their enterprises. Then M.S. Gorbachev's report on the situation in the Kuzbass delivered at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was heard on the radio. People stopped in the streets to pay tribute to the concern of the country's leaders and deputies over the situation in the Kuzbass. They reacted understandingly and cordially to the assessments of the complex situation voiced at the session. They are in sympathy with these assessments. The Kuznetsk workers are in favor of making faster progress with perestroyka, they want to manage better and to influence more effectively their enterprises' economic and social activity.

The government commission headed by N.N. Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, relying on party committees and in close contact with the oblast strike committee, has studied the situation thoroughly, is analyzing the questions that have arisen at the talks and taking coordinated decisions.

In 2 days of work on the spot the government commission has succeeded literally in meeting virtually all the Kuzbass workers' most acute demands. Today it is beginning more in-depth study of living and working conditions in the oblast's cities.

Although there is still enough emotion here, the workers who have returned to their enterprises have a sober and responsible attitude to the consequences of what has happened. Here are just some of the opinions that workers shared today.

V. Zemlyanukhin, mining foreman at "Kuznetskaya" mine:

"As a member of the oblast strike committee, I want to point out that workers reacted well to the commission which the government has entrusted with resolving the problems that have accumulated over the years in the localities. But we realized perfectly well that making large demands in the country's current strained situation means hoping to 'grab things' from other people. But that is not the way out.

"We acted in an organized fashion and attempted to maintain order in the city. It is necessary to ensure that these good qualities in the working class are not lost during the return to the coal face and the workshops."

A. Solovatov, mining worker at the "Krasnyy Uglekop" mine:

"Today, after completing our first shift after a week-long gap, we heard Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words on the radio at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, which are of very great importance for us."

V. Kuznetsov, shaft builder at the "Tsentralnaya" mine:

"The Kuzbass workers have not allowed either local babblers or provocateurs or those who have flown here from various cities and republics to enter their ranks. These people attempted to plant anti-Soviet slogans on the striking masses on the wave of our everyday workers' troubles."

A fresh item of news arrived at the press center which has opened in Prokopyevsk: The Kemerovo miners have called off their strike. Workers will be bused from Soviet Square to their enterprises.

Situation in 9 Centers Detailed

LD2007144589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Kemerovo (Kuzbass), 20 Jul (TASS)—People sighed with relief this morning in many towns and villages of the Kuzbass. The meetings in the squares and at the pits had quieted down and thousands of people had returned to the pitheads and enterprises.

After 10 troubled days, a long-awaited turning point has come. In the morning, from Prokopyevsk, from the press center of the operational headquarters set up there by the oblast party committee [obkom] with the support of central newspaper correspondents, TASS, and local journalists, the long-awaited news was broadcast over the oblast radio: The situation had returned to normal at 9 of the 11 major mining centers hit by the strike. Coal mining is being resumed at many pits and in the remainder the teams that remained at the pitheads to maintain the life-support systems are completing preparations for extraction. Only at Prokopyevsk and Kiselevsk, where a number of enterprises remain at a standstill despite the agreement protocol between the government commission and the oblast strike committee, has full work not yet been resumed. The protocol was disseminated to all towns yesterday. The workers' additional demands have been brought about primarily by the very acute situation that has developed in housing construction, the municipal economy, and the medical services.

The government commission headed by Nikolay Slyunkov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is continuing its work in the oblast. Thanks to its efforts, backed up by the work of the obkom headquarters, as well as the constructive position of the oblast strike committee, the tight knot of tension that had built up here has been loosened to a large degree. This knot had put a brake on the normal progress of perestroyka and the successful implementation of economic reform. At the same time, it had become a barrier to the region's social development. This was the cause of the workers' passionate actions.

The town of Belovo, for a which the members of the government commission set out this morning, was still one of the hotspots of the Kuzbass-wide strike yesterday. Today, after a week of standstill, the mines and other enterprises in the town have come to life. Here they consider that the decisive part in the turn of events for the better was played not only by the circulation here of a protocol on the measures agreed on, but also by the anxious words on the events in the Kuzbass uttered by M.S. Gorbachev at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the understanding of the Kuzbass problems and the miners' troubles with which he regarded the workers' lawful demands.

Belovo is one of the points on the route being taken by the government commission in the second stage of its work. The tasks of this stage is to make an in-depth evaluation of the situation on the spot, in each mining town, and to draw up proposals for the government and the Supreme Soviet on measures regarding the comprehensive development of the Kuzbass. In each town—and there are approximately 10 of them—a detailed analysis will have to be made of the situation; thoughtful work will have to be done with the local party, soviet, and trade union organizations and the strike committees, the activity of which, acording to the protocol signed, will continue until 1 August. The workers' headquarters, which was formed spontaneously to direct the strike process and has manifested, it must be noted, maximal determination and common sense, is faced with a difficult job on such a high level of organization and responsibility. An active part must be taken in eliminating the consequences of the strike, and together with the trade union and party committees more effective influence must be exercized in promoting the recovery of the production and the social sphere at enterprises in the town.

The harsh lessons of the 10-day strike have to be learned and each worker has to be made aware of them. The losses caused by the standstill at the mines and other enterprises amount to many millions of rubles. More than 150 enterprises, primarily coal enterprises, have stopped the conveyors. The stoppage in the delivery of coal and coke almost caused an all-union catastrophe on the 5th day of the strike: the stopping of the major metallurgical and power-engineering production facilities. That could have increased the damage to the country many times over.

For the 10th day at the town party committees, the executive committees, and the trade union committees, an analysis of what has happened is being made. The words of reproach at the rallies were directed at them, in particular. There need not have been a strike if the party, trade union, and local soviet leaders of the towns had investigated more thoroughly and deeply the concerns of the working people, had considered them their own concerns, and had solved efficiently all the problems created.

Strike Situation Roundup 19 Jul

PM2007160989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Series of reports by own correspondent V. But in Rostov-na-Donu, own correspondent N. Lisovenko in the Donbass, IZVESTIYA special correspondents P. Voroshilov and A. Solovyev in the Kuzbass, TASS in Vorkuta, and own correspondents S. Troyan in Pavlograd and O. Stefashin in Karaganda, under the general headline: "Difficult Road to Compromise"]

[Text] **Rostov-na-Donu**— On leaving the locker room the miners at the pit named for the 60th anniversaryy of the Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol], which is part of the "Gukovugol" Production Association, went to the square in front of the mine administration, not to the pithead. That was how the strike began at the enterprise on 19 July.

The miners had repeatedly put serious questions to the ministry and given it time to make decisions, but they had met with neither sympathy nor support. The situation was that the mine, from which the mine-construction and shaft-sinking teams had been removed prematurely, was capable neither of fulfilling the plan nor of solving the multitude of social problems that had accumulated. The miners had many demands, the same as

those of the miners of the Kuzbass and Makeyevka. But the paramount one is the demand for autonomy.

Oblast Party Committee [obkom] Secretary N. Kravchenko, Oblast Trade Union Council Chairman V. Voronin, the leaders of the Gukovo City Party Committee [gorkom] and City Soviet Executive Committee [ispolkom], and senior officials of "Gukovugol" oblast organizations have arrived at the enterprise. A quest is under way for a solution to the acute local and intradepartmental problems. There is a marked desire on the part of the strikers to return to work in order to avoid making any worse the already considerable losses.

Donbass—Yesterday evening in Donetsk miners from the city's biggest mine, the one named for the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKIY DONBASS, came to the obkom and oblast soviet executive committee [oblispkom] building, expressing soldarity with the miners of the Kuzbass and Makeyevka. What are they demanding? Virtually the same as the miners of the Kuzbass.

By the time the demands had been read out two important documents had arrived in Donetsk, and they were immediately read out in the square by party Obkom First Secretary A. Vinnik: first a telegram from M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov, and then a telegram from USSR Coal Industry Minister M.I. Shchadov. Whereas the first was greeted with approval, the second, because of its length and vague wording, gave rise to concern. The oblast strike committee and leaders had to meet again to discuss the miners' demands point by point and how to meet them.

The strike committee members received a telegram from Makeyevka in which the miners asked them not to start new strikes and not to destroy the already thoroughly disrupted production rhythm, after all the strike could spread to other sectors of industry....

IZVESTIYA is receiving similar telegrams. For example, from Lisichansk: "A halt in coal production is bound to bring a number of national economic enterprises to a halt and a chain reaction of plan nonfulfillment will be initiated.... While fully supporting the demands of the miners of the Kuzbass and the striking miners of Makeyevka, we, the miners of the mine named for G.G. Kapustin, urge all miners in the Soviet Union not to bring their enterprises to a halt but to return to the longwall and to the face...."

Representatives of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukrainian Trade Union Council, and the USSR Coal Industry Ministry have arrived for talks with the strikers. Many points in their demands have already been met, but much work still needs to be done on the others.

Kuzbass—The last day of the strike is 20 July. This is the agreed decision of the regional strike committee and the commission of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Mimisters, and the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions].

The miners are returning to work. And it is not just the miners' good sense. Let us look at the protocol signed by the state commission and regional committee. It contains a mutual admission of the causes of the exacerbation of the socioeconomic situation in the Kuzbass, and, consequently, of the strike. "They are," we quote, "the result of ministries' and departments' diktat and tyranny, local party and soviety organs' connivance, and the deterioration of supplies of food and essential goods for the population."

Indeed, the problems which are now having to be tackled on an emergency basis have been building up for years. Arrogant disregard for people's basic needs, an unwarranted attitude that miners' have inferior social needs, red tape getting in the way of the solution of urgent problems—it was all this that provoked the strike.

There are 36 points in the signed protocol. They are geared to eliminating the causes of the strike, beginning with the main one—the transfer of Kemerovo Oblast to regional economic accountability in January 1990 and the granting of economic and legal autonomy to enterprises.

The miners believe that there is no reason to continue the strike. Moreover, the direct losses as a result of it run into tens of millions. Collectives in other areas of the country are showering the Kuzbass with telegrams: Their work is being disrupted by breakdowns in coal supplies. Ultimately the strike dries up the material potential for meeting the demands of the miners themselves. Therefore they were sympathetic toward M.S. Gorbachev's USSR Supreme Soviet session speech, which appealed to their sense of responsibility.

"The strike has prompted us," Kemerovo Party Obkom First Secretary A. Melnikov said in Novokuznetsk, "to review our cadre policy and get rid of those who are sitting tight in party committees and ispolkoms and doing nothing.

Vorkuta—Putting forward demands of a socioeconomic nature, the entire collective of the "Vorkutaugol" Association's "Khalmer-Yu" pit stopped work on 19 July. A commission of senior officials of the party obkom, the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, and the oblast trade unions council arrived in Vorkuta.

The miners of Vorkuta sent a letter to the leaders of the country and the sector. It speaks of the need urgently to resolve the acute economic and social problems of the coal sector, as well as specific issues affecting working people in regions of the Far North. Emergency sessions of the party committees of a number of Vorkuta pits were held. It was decided to submit a request to the

country's Supreme Soviet, via their USSR people's deputies, that the question of the work of the USSR Minsitry of the Coal Industry in ensuring an effective, balanced economic and social policy in the sector be included on the agenda at the current session.

Pavlograd—The miners of the Western Donbass began a strike on 19 July. All 11 pits of the "Pavlogradugol" Association in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast stopped work. The initiator of this form of struggle for their rights was the collective of the "Blagodatnaya" pit. In the evening of 19 July more than 3,000 people gathered in the city square. The strike committee put forward the same demands as in the Kuzbass and the Central Donbass. Demands of "local" significance were also put forward: to close the departmental hotel, although it is the only one in Pavlograd, and make the building available for a kindergarten. And to close the canteen in the association's premises, although it is an ordinary public catering outlet.

On the 1st day the miners of the Western Donbass did not produce a single tonne of fuel, although they usually bring up at least 40,000 tonnes of coal.

By 1300 hours on 20 July the strike committees were holding talks with representatives of the administration.

Karaganda—On the morning of 20 July miners at coal enterprises located in the city of Shakhtinsk began a strike. First, four pits stopped work, then three more joined them. By noon the miners of the neighboring city of Abay had joined the people of Shakhtinsk. The number of strikers was in excess of 16,000. Many of them gathered in Central Square to formulate a program and demands, which the strike committee decided to convey to the oblast leadership. In principle they are the same as those of the Donetsk and Kuzbass miners.

Attempts by members of the Karaganda party obkom bureau and the leadership of the "Karagandaugol" Association to enter into dialogue and find some kind of compromise solution so that the miners would resume work came to nothing. The strike committee is standing its ground firmly: The miners will only return to the pits when all their demands are fulfilled.

Donbass Strikes Continue 19 Jul

PM2007122689 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 8

[Own correspondent N. Lisovenko report: "Donbass: Awaiting a Decision"]

[Text] As a result of talks between the strike committee in Makeyevka and representatives of the local authority and coal industry leaders, it was acknowledged that half of the miners' demands could be satisfied on the spot and removed from the list. The other half—19 points concerning increasing leave, setting pensions, recognizing silicosis and anthracosis as industrial diseases, and so forth—was submitted to Anatoliy Saunin, people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for him to bring them urgently to the attention of the government.

On 18 July the striking miners of Makeyevka were joined by the miners of Yenakiyevo, Shakhtersk, Selidovo, Krasnoarmeysk, and other cities in the Donbass. On 19 July the collectives of 62 of the oblast's 120 mines did not turn up for the first shift. The area's biggest pit, the "Stakhanov," has stopped producing coal. Whereas on the 1st day, when seven pits were on strike, the shortfall amounted to R2 million worth of coal, on 18 July the figure was R14 million. Today the lost fuel will cost an estimated R20 million.

Aware of this, the miners of the Donetsk "Kalinin" and "Ye.T. Abakumov" mines and a number of others have decided, without stopping work, to insist on the satisfaction of the demands of the coal men of Makeyevka, Mezhdurechensk, and other cities, since they all share the same troubles. A similar position has been adopted by many mining collectives in Voroshilovgrad Oblast.

Strike committees are everywhere maintaining both social and production order (pumping, ventilating, and cooling equipment is in operation everywhere, so that the mines do not go out of commission).

Every attempt to persuade people to disperse to their enterprises—until the completion of talks—has failed to meet with success in Makeyevka. The inactivity of the Ukrainian government is perplexing, and the local trade union leaders appear helpless. Their prestige, compared with that of the strike committees, is negligible. The miners will agree to talk only with people's deputies and party workers. The lessons of the present strike still have to be studied and studied.

Donbass Situation 'Cause for Alarm'

LD2007184189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Donetsk, 20 July (TASS)—Six of the seven pits in Sovetskiy Rayon of Makeyevka, where the strike began, resumed operations tonight. The rayon strike committee was convinced that its demands were satisfied by the local administration and that the decisions adopted for the Kuzbass will be extended to all Ukrainian miners. The committee resolved that work should be resumed on the third shift. Representatives of the Makeyevka miners called upon their comrades in Donetsk and other coal mining centers to do the same. But as yet there has been no positive response. The strikers want authoritative assurances.

However, such assurances have been published here. Today the newspaper VECHERNIY DONETSK, breaking its normal schedule, was published this morning and distributed in all the "coal" towns of the oblast. It published a report from Prokopyevsk with the text of the agreement between the regional strike committee and

the commission of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the USSR Central Council of Trade Unions on meeting the demands of the workers at the striking enterprises of the Kuzbass, which will be extended to coal miners of the Donbass and other regions of the Ukraine.

This agreement grants full economic and juridical independence to underground and opencast mines and envisages raising the prices for coal in accordance with the actual extraction costs. The industry's enterprises now have the right to independently establish norms of output and pay and norms for provision of services. Additional payments have been introduced as of 1 July this year for evening and night shifts by workers in this industry, and work is being carried out to establish a day-off for everyone on Sundays. Agreements were adopted on other demands made by the miners.

However, the state of affairs in the coal industry in the Donbass continues to be a cause of alarm. The strike is continuing at the majority of mines. This is seriously aggravating the fuel supply situation in the European part of the USSR. At present, the miners are releasing restricted amounts from the large stocks of coal that have accumulated in storage areas. These are being supplied mainly to coke-chemical works for processing into metallurgical raw material. But the losses in the amount of coal mined caused by the strike have already exceeded ⅓ of 1 million tonnes.

Leading officials of the republic, including Vitaliy Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, are now in the Donetsk Basin.

Strikes Spread to Northern Kazakhstan

LD2007131689 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Karaganda July 20 TASS—Miners' strikers in Western Siberia's Kuzbass and the Ukraine's Donbass areas spread to pits in the Karaganda coal basin in northern Kazakhstan when individual work crews staged a walk-out last night at four mines in the towns of Abay and Shakhtinsk near this regional center.

Their spokesman explained the decision by the failure of the mass media to report all the demands of the striking Kuzbass miners.

By this evening, 14 mines in the Karaganda Basin were at a standstill. Striking miners are holding rallies in the central squares of Abay and Shakhtinsk.

Local government and party leaders opened direct dialogue with them, but neither explanations nor appeals have as yet had any effect.

Kazakhstan Miners Continue Strike

LD2007144689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1338 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Alma-Ata, 20 Jul (TASS)—TASS correspondents Azamat Autalipov and Raisa Ioffe report:

The miners of the "Karagandaugol" production association (Central Kazakhstan) have joined the strikes by miners at the Kuznetsk and Donbass coal basins in the USSR.

At 0200 today, individual teams and sections at four pits situated in the towns of Abay and Shakhtinsk neighboring on the oblast center refused to go down to the pits. They declared a strike in support of the Kuzbass miners.

Representatives of the strike committees said the motive for this decision was that the mass media had not revealed all the points of the demands of the Kuzbass miners. Dissatisfaction was also caused by the absence in statements voiced at the USSR Supreme Soviet session of any guarantees that the satisfaction of the just demands of the workers of the Kuzbass coal enterprises would be fully extended to the miners of the Karaganda basin, the third most important coal-mining association in the USSR.

A joint session of representatives of the miners and the trade union committee took place at the "Kirovskaya" mine on Wednesday. Those present expressed a lack of confidence in the miners trade union committee and adopted a decision to hold extraordinary elections to the enterprise's trade union organization. Mikhail Knyazev, chairman of the Oblast Trade Union council, who was present, agreed with this decision. The meeting supported the Kuzbass miners' just demands, but adopted a decision not to strike, acknowledging such a move to be an extreme measure under the circumstances.

At noon today, miners of all four sections went to the pits, but at 1450, the miners of the second section, followed later by others, returned to the surface. According to Yesen Karimov, chief of sector two, yesterday's conversation was continued underground and no one had gone to work. Therefore he decided to bring the men up. An impassioned meeting was held in front of the pit building and a strike committee started to be formed.

By 1600, 14 pits in the basin had stopped work. Crowded rallies of striking miners are being held in the central squares of Abay and Ahakhtinsk.

Vorkuta Mine Strike Spreads

LD2007151589 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Vorkuta, northern Russian, July 20 TASS—A strike started at the Khalmer-yu mine here spread today to involve nine of this polar city's 13 pits.

The Pechora coal basin's largest mine, Vorgashorskaya, is among those affected by the stoppage.

The strikers' economic demands include the rights of state enterprises for mines, better food supplies, longer vacation, and higher pay for night work.

Some Issues Resolved in Donetsk

LD2007162489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Here is a report from the town of Makeyevka in Donetsk Oblast.

After the telegram of Comrades Gorbachev and Ryzhkov addressed to the miners, the strikers have started assessing the situation that has come about in a calmer and more balanced manner. The united strike committee has called on the collectives of all mines not to join in the strike as it no longer needs support; the path to a constructive dialogue has been laid.

Gladush, the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], Fisun, first deputy minister of the USSR Coal Industry, and the leaders of the industry's trade union have arrived here to take part in resolving the conflict. In the course of a joint discussion with the participation of local soviet, trade union, and party bodies, it has already been possible to satisfy a number of demands within the scope of the local administration. In particular, it has been decided to set firm rates for coal production for the period that it is brought up to the washeries, and also per-meter rates for drifts tunnelled in certain conditions. Mine directors have been given instructions on the application of additional payments to miners and drift miners working with pneumatic drills. Henceforth, the soviets of enterprise labor collectives have the right to grant additional leave to people employed on faces which are dangerous with respect to silicosis, and also, upon agreement with the administration, to institute for mines a discontinuous working week with Sunday as the common day off.

It has also been decided to introduce pay increments for work during evening and night shifts.

Subject to decision by the labor collective soviets of enterprises, women (?will) henceforth be granted paid leave to look after babies for a period of up to 3 years, which will be financed from the material incentive funds.

The USSR minister of the coal industry, Shchadov, has responded to workers' demands and has abolished the order to increase the annual task for the Yasinovskaya-Glubokaya mine. This collective is now permitted to mine 100,000 tonnes of coal less per annum, while retaining its previous wage fund.

The participants in the strike have handed over another group of questions for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Some of the demands put forward by those in Makeyevka are the same as those from workers of the entire industry. They are being resolved by the government commission which is now working in the Kuzbass.

Unions Support Donbass Strikers

LD2007193689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent G. Kondaurov] Here we are on one of the main squares in the town of Donetsk. It is the square in front of the House of the Soviets building, where the oblast party committee is located. Thousands of miners involved in the strike at the Donetsk mines have gathered here. Nine mines out of the 21 in Donetsk are on strike. Around 100 Donbass mines are continuing their strike as of this moment. These are mines in Donestk, Krasnoarmeysk, Stakhanov, the town of Krasnodon, and other towns in the Donbass. Now on the square here a meeting is taking place between the miners and the government commission which has just arrived to study the miners' demands and to reply to them. The commission is headed by Lev Dmitriyevich Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. [video shows crowd in square being addressed by officials]

[Kondaurov addresses man captioned as V.A. Sologub, chairman of the republican council of trade unions] Vitaliy Alekseyevich, whose side are the trade unions on?

[Sologub] I can tell you that we spent all day yesterday and all night until seven o'clock in the morning examining all the demands voiced by the strike committees. All the demands are just, we support them, and as trade unions we shall exert maximum persistence to ensure that these proposals are implemented at all levels. Be it in Kiev, or in Moscow, or in the government of the USSR, we shall show our true character.

[Kondaurov] I can tell you the losses that the industry of the Donbass is incurring as a result of this strike. Around 200,000 tons of coal has already been lost, and every day we are losing more than R5million as a result of this strike in the Donbass.

Rostov Miners Air Concerns

LD2007220389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jul 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Alarming reports on miners' strikes have been coming through the teleprinters in our editorial room. Such reports have arrived from Vorkuta, Pavlograd in Denepropetrovsk Oblast, Abay and Shakhtinsk in

Karaganda Oblast. Here is a graphic representation of the current situation by our artist. [Video shows the country's contours on the map with a pneumatic drill cutting its way into the middle of the map and sending cracks in all directions. There are also concentric circles in three colours around the drill: a yellow circle in the center, followed by a blue one, and then a red one. The video cuts to a report by N. Chebotarev at the settlement of Zverevo, Rostov Oblast]

[Chebotarev, in progress] ...named after the 60th anniversary of the Leninist Komsomol. This is the largest and the most recently opened pit in the eastern Donbass. The miners have elected a strike committee, drawn up demands, and made them public at a rally. When you read the miners' demands carefully, it becomes clear that it is the social problems on a local scale which are unresolved in smaller towns and miners' settlements over many years that are the chief reason behind people's indignation, leading to a strike.

It has long been known that the residents of these mining settlements in Rostov Oblast make regular forays into the neighboring Ukrainian towns to stock up on foodstuffs and other vital supplies. [camera scans a square which is flooded with strikers, then shows interviews]

[A.G. Kudrya, chairman of the strike committee] Can you imagine that each miner has got a butter ration of 200 grams per month? So, how can we work? Two hundred grams of soap for 3 months. It is a shame, but people do know how dirty miners are when they get out of the pit, and one bar of soap is only enough for one wash.

[Chebotarev] The miners cited the following fact: For many years they have been indignant over the poor quality of the bread which is baked in the settlement of Zverevo. And of that demand by the strikers—one of their demands—a representative of the town executive committee said: Bread has always been like that and always will be. The myopia of some bureaucrats is truly amazing. They are incapable of finding the right words, even in this electrified atmosphere.

[A.G. Kudrya] I am expressing everyone's view that literally all miners of the Soviet Union should urgently—perhaps, even before the end of the month—convene a congress of mining workers involving all workers, or rather representatives of all working collectives, without any officials of the higher echelons of the administration.

[Chebotarev] The speech of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the session of the Supreme Soviet generated hope among the miners, hope and understanding. They are aware of the fact that the losses incurred in the course of the strike are also all losses of funds which could have been earmarked for the resolution of the social issues.

[Kudrya] Well, I think that the funds which were taken away from our pit during the past years when the pit's profits were in the millions, whereas we in this godforsaken settlement used to get nothing, nothing at all. [sentence as heard] So, let them give us back at least a bit of what they owe us. We are all acutely aware that we have some work to do. Each of us is personally involved in the affairs of this pit; because it is our home, we spend most of our lives down there.

Karaganda Miners List Demands

LD2107072989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Excerpts] The Karaganda miners' strike continues. Our correspondent (Gennadiy Sytykh) reports:

One of the reasons for the strike is the fact that all the demands made by the workers of the Kuzbass have not been published. Also, the telegram from the [coal industry] minister, Comrade Shchadov, in which it said that many questions had been resolved, was not made known to the working collectives in good time. But the reasons for people's discontent are of course deeper. They are indignant at the shameful system of privileges, whereby some people undeservedly enjoy benefits at the expense of others; the inveterate indifference of the administration regarding the interests of workers; the endless promises instead of deeds; the domination of those in charge. At the rallies, one becomes well aware that the social explosion has been provoked precisely by the local situation. [passage omitted]

The Shakhtinsk town and oblast leaders met with the workers. Peoples deputies Donchak and Ramazanov have flown in from Moscow. According to preliminary data, among the number of demands being made by the strikers are the following points: To eliminate the Karagandaugol Association and to create in its place a council of directors of the basin's mines; to hand over its buildings for use by children; to transform the Coal Industry Ministry into a scientific center; to abolish all benefits and privileges for party and local soviet staff and other leaders; to close the nuclear testing ground in Semipalatinsk.

Coal Minister Offers Help

18220162 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Jul 89 p 2

[Report by N. Goncharov and A. Parshintsev (Kemerovo): "A Seminar Against the Background of a Strike"]

[Text] Journalists from all corners of the country gathered in Kemerovo on 12 July for an all-union emergency meeting. But the program had to be significantly changed because of the events that began 2 days ago in the city of Mezhdurechensk in the south of the Kuzbass [Kuznets Basin]. One of the shifts of miners from the Mine imeni Shevyakov did not come up from the working face and another refused to go down into the mine. The strikers were supported by collectives of four mining enterprises

and other organizations of the city. Soon masses of people—from 12,000 to 15,000—had gathered in the city's main square in front of the party gorkom [city committee].

The minister of the coal industry, M. Shchadov, who was going to the meeting with the journalists, changed his itinerary and went to Mezhdurechensk. Along with him came the first secretary of the Kemerovo party obkom [oblast committee], A. Melnikov, and the chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee], A. Lyutenko.

The coal miners who had left work presented their demands to the leaders of the ministry and the oblast. For the question did not come up all of a sudden. For many years the ministries and departments had been forcing the development of fuel extraction, and the vital problems of the Kuzbass workers were shoved into the background. As a result the oblast, having produced several billion tons of coal during the years of Soviet power, is experiencing a critical shortage of housing, hospital beds, schools, kindergartens, and cultural institutions.

Minister M. Shchadov expressed an opinion regarding each point of the demands made by the strikers and made decisions on issues that fell within the ministry's competence. But some of the demands pertain to local soviet and management organs and certain of them must be resolved at the level of the government.

Making direct contact with the USSR Council of Ministers, M. Shchadov after a certain amount of time notified the strikers that beginning in the second half of the year they would be paid a 40-percent increment for work on the night shift, and, incidentally, this was not only for miners of Mezhdurechensk but for all miners of the Kuzbass. Additional meat and sugar were allotted for the oblast as well as buses to take the miners to their work place.

Many of those gathered in the square were satisfied with these measures. But quite a few people still remained by the bonfires until morning. Discussion also continued here during the night. The situation in the city is still difficult.

Thus the journalists who came for their emergency meeting involuntarily ended up in the center of complicated events which pertain directly to the subject of their seminar: "Prospects for Socioeconomic Development of the Country's Coal Regions." The meeting was opened by the editor-in-chief of the newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, the secretary of the USSR Union of Journalists, A. Baranov.

Deputy Interviewed on Strike

LD2007133889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0230 GMT on 20 July broadcasts within its "120 Minutes" program an 8-minute interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Mikhail Bocharov by Aleksandr Serikov. The live or recorded interview takes place in the studio. No date for the interview is given.

Asked about the current coal miner strikes, Bocharov says he took part in the Supreme Soviet debates on the subject yesterday. "Yesterday's Supreme Soviet session started with a discussion of these very serious problems which have emerged in our country, I dare say for the first time in many, many years. I see it certainly as a pattern, a pattern we have persistently been heading for and creating conditions for the working class in these industrial areas, especially in the heavy industry areas. They have lost patience. The working class does not believe the local bodies of power when they say there will be a change. They are right not to believe them, although as an economist—and I think to some degree I am an economist—I think the strike movement and the strikes are inflicting colossal and irreparable material damage. Nevertheless, at certain moments they are necessary. They are necessary so that the party and local soviet bodies will finally recognize that these half-baked measures, these promises, and the reservoir of confidence given by the people to our state leaders is over. It is the first serious call and I very much hope there will not be any more such calls which could paralyze the country."

Asked what the solution is, Bocharov says: "There is only one way out. First, although we have confirmed the composition of the government and a number of supreme bodies of state power, we must take another look. I think the people who are again heading what we will call the bodies of administration and bodies of power are not quite in keeping with the requirements of today which the people demand. I think Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev needs a somewhat different team, a team which must approach the solution of the problem in a more cardinal way, in a more unconventional way, in a more revolutionary way you could even say. And I think the task of the Supreme Soviet, perhaps this aktiv of the Supreme Soviet, is to do everything to help Mikhail Sergeyevich in this respect. And I think he should also begin by facilitating the quick entry of the Supreme Soviet—as the supreme body of the state—into normal activity, no doubt, turn around and have a look at who he has around him.

"I would especially like to say... [Bocharov changes thought] so far there are no detailed documents about the conference of first secretaries of party committees of our country, but I think there is much resistance—this is my personal opinion—from the party committees, the majority of party committees on the spot, resistance to the general secretary's policy, the policy of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. It is the task of the Supreme Soviet to act today so that our chairman can received the support and necessary backing which could break the resistance to perestroyka which is before our very eyes, which is on the spot—resistance to perestroyka, resistance to the new approach to many vital problems."

As general director of the Butovskiy building materials combine, Bocharov says perestroyka is already in action there. He says all the present troubles in the Kuzbass and Donbass and the ethnic troubles are based on economics. At Butovskiy combine they have started autonomy, the autonomy which the coal miners are demanding.

"Today we are not just developing lease contracting and perfecting it, but we are now proposing further steps in a new understanding of the economy, of the economic mechanism. A document has been drafted and is being examined today at the highest level of the government on the creation of what we have provisionally named the Butovo people's firm, with full autonomy, subordinated to no one, neither ministry nor department nor bodies of Soviet power. This is a very important question. That is, the enterprise has complete autonomy, relations with the state are only via the taxation system. It is a completely new approach to current economic activity, financial activity. I would say one of the main directions is the development of new types of ownership. We are already introducing the concept of collective ownership, a combination of state, collective, and cooperative. There is a new approach to what we can have in our Soviet Union in the near future."

Bocharov concludes by saying more must be done for the worker.

Central Committee Discusses Gorbachev Report 18 Jul

PM2107092989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Second Edition pp 1-4

[TASS report on discussion of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's report at conference of party first secretaries held at CPSU Central Committee on 18 July: "Rethinking the Party's Function and Role in Society"]

[Text] As already reported, a conference of first secretaries of union republic communist party central committees, kray party committees [kraykoms], and oblast party committees [obkoms] was held at the CPSU Central Committee on 18 July to examine certain questions of party work under the conditions of restructuring.

The conference saw a thorough and committed discussion on the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, came to the rostrum. The unprecedented activeness of sociopolitical life and the acute manifestation of sensitive issues and centers of social impatience, he said, may seem to be virtually a crisis of restructuring. There are people who are ready to sound the alarm: But should they have started to do so? The general disquiet is understandable, but, after all, it is obvious to everyone today that there was no alternative to restructuring. I am convinced—and this is the dominant opinion of Armenian communists—that the party displayed true courage and a principled approach in offering the policy of restructuring to the people at this very difficult time and in assuming the responsibility for implementing it. No one can nullify the fact that restructuring has established deep roots and today determines all our affairs.

Speaking about the activation of the work of numerous informal organizations and action groups, the speaker stressed that it would be politically wrong to ignore these movements and that Armenian communists have embarked on open dialogue with them. It was necessary to enter more boldly into constructive collaboration with those who really adhere to positions of restructuring and socialism.

We are learning to work in a new way as we go along, and that is not easy, the speaker said. The party is now at a crucial stage. The main question that confronts us is how to advance restructuring further. If we put it in the strictest terms, then today we are talking about whether the party is capable of fulfilling the role of the political vanguard of society under current conditions. The CPSU's activity has for virtually all the postrevolutionary period been subject, as is well known, to disagreeable, sometimes very, very cutting criticism, even to the point of rejection. One cannot close one's eyes to the fact that this has led to a marked devaluation of our ideals and values among quite a large section of our population, particularly the young.

Life has shown that we still lack full clarity, let alone an integrated concept of CPSU activity in modern conditions, although a certain step was made in this regard at the 19th party conference. Nevertheless the question arises: What is the party's role in the life of today's society as it undergoes renewal, and what are the forms of its relations with the soviets? After all, it is no secret that the return to the slogan "All power to the soviets" has been interpreted by some people as a way of depriving the party of political influence and questioning its leading role in society.

The speaker expressed the opinion that the time has come to start direct preparations for the next party congress, which must be held in the fall of next year. It would be wrong to put off holding the congress in the present difficult, crucial period.

Unfortunately, S.G. Arutyunyan said, we quite often find ourselves on the defensive—this was correctly pointed out in M.S. Gorbachev's report—and we lag behind with initiatives and the solution of issues that worry people. This stems from party committees' inability to structure their work in a new way under the new conditions. The command-and-injunction method no longer works. Party authority should always be underpinned by the authority of real actions, real steps, real deeds.

It is perfectly obvious that there is no task today more important than speeding up the social reorientation of our economic development. Delay in solving these questions has already led to a situation in which a flood of rallies is developing into a wave of strikes. The strikes in the Kuzbass have been directly caused by the lack of a solution to acute socioeconomic problems in the region. After all, we have quite a few such regions in the country.

The delay in solving questions of interethnic relations is fraught with grave consequences. The present aggravation of the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh is bound up with the fact that people are tired of the long wait and have begun to lose hope that their national aspirations will be met.

The speaker then went on to dwell on the problem of party cadres and the need to go to the masses and engage in a broad dialogue with people.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom], was then called to speak.

The sociopolitical situation in Moscow, as in the rest of the country, he remarked, is determined to a large extent by the politicization of society and at the same time by the exacerbation of economic and social problems. The abrupt transition from a long period of apathy to energetic political activity has generated a multitude of contradictory opinions, judgments, and views. Quite often emotion prevails over reason, and words are valued over action. We have quite a few loudmouths and demagogues of various sorts in our country who avoid actual work and personal responsibility like the plague. They want only to criticize and let others do the work.

Recently we have been acutely aware that many party committees are losing control of the situation, avoiding discussion of urgent problems, and preferring to limit themselves to the range of traditional and purely economic questions. They have been resolving them from the standpoint of the past.

It cannot be overlooked, the speaker went on, that there are certain forces exploiting the wave of perestroyka. They are doing everything to discredit the party and our entire state. They are deliberately confusing the party's healthy forces with the corrupt, the healthy organs of the state with the bureaucratic, and sound economic initiatives with those which must be replaced.

There was a principled discussion on this at a recent party gorkom plenum. We deliberately heightened matters so that not a single question remained unclear and so that everything was made absolutely plain.

It turned out that a considerable section of the capital's communists and population have a poor idea of the vitally important problems for all Muscovites that the party gorkom is resolving and what its position is on particular questions of principle. We are now taking measures to ensure that people know the personal viewpoint of the leaders of the city and rayons.

The party gorkom supported a raykoms' initiative on the production of rayon newspapers, which are of exceptionally great importance for Moscow, but without finding support at the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, unfortunately. Matters are reaching an absurd state: Every rural rayon in our country has its own newspaper, and that is how it should be; but in the capital, where each rayon is equal in size to an oblast center, there are no such newspapers.

Many party workers still cannot rid themselves of the sense that their truth is incontestable. Sometimes they try to issue incompetent directives in all directions in the party's name. The habit not of trying to convince an opponent but of "speaking the solemn truth" and the inability to conduct a discussion without raising the voice in a domineering manner are largely due to their powerlessness and confusion in today's extremely complex conditions.

How are we combating this harmful custom? On the recommendation of the party gorkom commission, the extensive retraining of party cadres has been launched on the basis of the Moscow Higher Party School. But for that work the lecturers had to retrain themselves, too. It must be said bluntly that the reduction of the party apparatus and the changes in its structure have not yet produced results.

We have not mastered political methods of leadership, and the erosion of the functions of Soviet organs and cadres' lack of preparation continue to embroil us in the solution of purely economic problems. Our economic workers and executive committee [ispolkom] workers had gotten used to running to the rayon committee [raykom] for advice on every question, even the unimportant ones, and they still do it now. They are hedging, trying to shift the responsibility from themselves.

The solution to this task is to grant complete independence to rayon soviets, as we are doing right now. But the transfer of rights presumes the transfer and enhancement of responsibility, too. That clearly is hampering the rayon executive committees [rayispolkom].

It is no secret that many communists are dissatisfied with the state of affairs in the party and in all its links right up to the Central Committee. Increasingly frequently party organizations are issuing proposals to revise the party Statutes so as to make them more democratic, to change the procedure for the election of leading organs, and to reduce the period between party congresses and thus of the entire report and election campaign preceding them. I support M.S. Gorbachev's proposal to switch the routine 28th CPSU Congress to fall 1990.

The party gorkom plenum also opened our eyes to many things. We felt that the direct link with and feedback from primary organizations have weakened and that there are many things that ordinary communists do not understand. Hence, too, their dissatisfaction and the passivity of whole organizations. This is used by our opponents, who are vigorously overstating the thesis of the undemocratic nature of the CPSU. The gorkom plenum supported the proposal to hold a Moscow-wide discussion on the place and role of the city party organization in the capital's life and in the forms and methods of its work. We believe that this discussion should not be restricted to the framework of party organizations. We intend to draw Muscovites into its orbit, including those members of "informal" groups who adhere to constructive positions.

How are we conducting the discussion? Primarily we are demanding that party workers go out to people and explain our position and our action program for overcoming the difficulties in the economic and social sphere.

What do we expect the debate to produce? We believe that it will make it possible to persuade the skeptics, to rally communists, and to prepare businesslike proposals for the forthcoming congress. Of course, more precise Central Committee guidelines are also needed here.

I would like, the speaker said, to emphasize the main point: Only tolerance and respect for one another can bring us closer to society's consolidation.

We were convinced of this during the last session of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies on such an an extremely acute question as the problem of the ecology.

There were about 600 deputies taking part in the session's work, including a number of USSR people's deputies, and almost as many representatives of informal ecological associations. Typically the "informals'" representatives actively backed the position of the party gorkom and the Moscow City Soviet on most issues, and primarily against the diktat of some ministries and departments and of the gorispolkom and rayispolkoms. It appeared that most departments in Moscow have their patrons who, on the one hand, advocate cutbacks in the construction of administrative and production projects in the city and, on the other, amend proposals made by the gorkom and Moscow Gorispolkom.

We proposed that the construction of such projects be cut back by R2.4 billion in the 13th 5-Year Plan, which would enable us to be more vigorous in resolving the city's social problems. We were backed by the Central Committee in this. But, as a result of subsequent studies, the suggested sum was reduced by R1 billion.

It is well known that a number of resolutions on Moscow have been adopted by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR Council of Ministers. These resolutions generated certain expectations and hopes among Muscovites that many problems of the city, with its several million inhabitants, would be eliminated.

We cannot allow any gaps to open up between word and action. Attempts to do this are already being made. This will intensify social tension in the city and negative attitudes toward local and central organs of power. This would be especially intolerable when we have made sound headway in every rayon and at every enterprise, including work on preparation for the transition to economic accountability as of January next year. This is a specific example of party work on the introduction of economic reform.

Political methods of leadership primarily mean the pursuit of cadre policy. In order to break the nomenklatura cycle, we reviewed the criteria for cadre appraisal and we are taking calculated risks by promoting extraordinary individuals, including nonparty people. We are resolutely rejecting the notorious "quota workers," even though this has proved to be far from easy. This also applies to the leadership link. Moscow has experienced numerous cadre shakeups which failed to produce positive results. Even directors of vegetable distribution centers and stores were brought to the capital from all corners of the country. They were allocated housing while the standard of services for Muscovites remained extremely poor, as ever.

Today we are actively promoting native Muscovites who ardently love their city. Moreover, we do this in conditions of glasnost and, as a rule, on a competitive basis, relying on people's opinions.

We are fully convinced that glasnost and the availability of information from the top on down provide the foundation of party work in contemporary conditions. This is another sphere where we had not done enough. We agreed with the party aktiv to change the methods and forms of our work.

Quite often party committees blame the shortage of information for their passiveness. This is incorrect. We have more than enough information. The sort of information we actually use is a different matter.

People in our country have gotten used to believing what the press says. The most authoritative attribution is: "I personally heard it on the radio, I saw it on television."

The press has indeed done a lot for perestroyka. But what is happening now? There is indiscriminate propaganda of Western values. The news from "over there" is about luxury villas, cars, store windows, and so on. And what about the news from our own country? Perpetual shortages, lawbreaking, drug addiction. As if perestroyka had changed nothing, as if we can find no other color but black to paint the picture of ourselves.

Glasnost cannot be served in measured doses. But we must display at least objectivity and patriotic interest in the improvement of affairs.

We have also acquired a very strange idea about criticism and self-criticism, about internal party democracy. We analyzed the protocols of party meetings and party committee sittings at a number of scientific and education collectives. What transpired? No end of criticism aimed at the top. Everyone was to blame—the Central Committee, the Council of Ministers, the gorkom, the raykoms. This is now considered the proper thing to do. But there is not a single critical word about the leaders of their own subdivisions, in other words of those who are primarily responsible for the material and service prosperity of the critics, and even criticism of their own party organization is rather thin on the ground.

A difficult stage lies ahead of us—elections to the republican and local soviets of people's deputies. We have embarked on preparations for them. Unfortunately, things are not going too well because the elaboration of the laws on local self-management and on elections is dragging on. Time is passing, and we are once more lagging behind. And this does not apply to Moscow alone.

The situation in the country is extremely tense. We cannot close our eyes to this. There are dark forces speculating on the slogans of perestroyka and rallying people on a basis of nationalism, corruption, and anti-Sovietism. I believe that, while elaborating the concept of a rule-of-law state, it is necessary to rigorously apply the existing laws, and the law enforcement organs are not doing that today.

Ideological compromises are impermissible. The CPSU today is the only political force capable of rallying people and managing [upravlyat] the sociopolitical situation in the country. It is incumbent on us to do everything to ensure that its authority is enhanced.

The party has never before found itself in a situation as complex as the present one, A.M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, said in his speech. On the one hand it is the initiator of perestroyka, on the other hand it has become the target of total criticism. Numerous rallies and demonstrations, instances of refusal to work, and growing tension in interethinc relations are becoming facts of life. One gets the impression that someone is skillfully manipulating the people's dissatisfaction with the party. Expressions like "party mandarins," "party functionaries," "bureaucrats," and other such expressions are circulating. People continue to write and talk about special privileges enjoyed by party workers. The intensive work done during the years of collectivization, the country's industrialization, and the Great Patriotic War is now presented as a downright mistake, a deviation from Lenin's directives.

In this complex situation, many communists and party committee leaders are afraid of appearing conservative. So they play up to Philistine attitudes and engage in public castigation of the party. This became especially apparent during the election campaign. We heard statements like that being made from the rostrum of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. How can we fail to recall Lenin's warning that nobody would ever succeed in discrediting the ideals of communism unless it was the communists themselves.

On the pretext of seeking new forms and methods of work, the speaker went on, people often reject out of hand everything existing in the party arsenal: The traditions of Bolshevism, the experience of the party's organizational and political struggle elaborated during the more than 80 years of its history. There are increasingly frequent instances of groundless criticism of the most important Leninist principle of party building—democratic centralism. In this context, it is high time to clearly define the borderline between party and state discipline and the pluralism of opinions. Unfortunately, irresponsibility is often tolerated beneath the camouflage of pluralism, and quite a few major decisions remain just so many pieces of paper.

Since the start of the 5-Year Plan period, the speaker said, there has been an increase in per capita consumption of the most important foodstuffs, and more housing and more facilities for social and cultural purposes are being built. At the same time, we have many shortcomings and difficulties, we speak about them frankly, and we appraise the situation realistically. Even though the situation as a whole is healthy, we still feel the effect of unresolved socioeconomic problems which have built up over the years.

Voices have been heard recently raising doubts about the existing party nomenklatura. It probably needs improvement. On the whole, however, taking out of the party's hands a tried and tested weapon like cadre policy would mean actually undermining its leading role.

It is impossible to keep silent about the fact that some mass media strive to evade party control and, on the pretext of criticizing mistakes committed in the past, are busy compromising our sociopolitical system. Essentially, a harsh struggle for people's minds is being waged. The press and television use all possible genres to discredit our achievements and set the people against the party. They are succeeding in this to a certain extent. We must take note of this as well.

Statements like this have also been made in our own republic. Their gross and unceremonious interference in the Kirghiz people's spiritual life and in the most acute problem of national-Russian bilingualism harmed us and engendered a negative public response.

Events at this stage of perestroyka are developing quickly and require rapid analysis and response, A.S. Myakota, first secretary of the Poltava Ukrainian communist Party Obkom, pointed out in his speech. In his opinion, the progress of the economic and political reforms affects the people's moral-political state.

The speaker emphasized that economic reform is developing evenly in Poltava Oblast. Nonetheless, there has been a shortfall of R24 million in output over the last 6 months. Indebted enterprises include the automobile plant at Kremenchug, which fell under its quota by 600 automobiles because the Yaroslavl plant failed to meet motor delivery targets. The Yerevan cable plant is to blame for the fact that some electric cables were not received, which resulted in a shortfall of 20,000 of the requisite electric motors. Some 70,000 tonnes of high-quality iron ore concentrate have piled up at the mining and enriching combine in Poltava Oblast today; there is a shortage of 1,200 freightcars to ship it out. We ourselves are causing this situation, the speaker said. He expressed the wish that party obkom secretaries and Council of Ministers representatives would prevent such failures, which make a powerful impact on the psychological climate at labor collectives.

Going on to indicate definite improvements in the agro-industrial complex, the speaker noted on the psychological climate in the countryside following the Central Committee March plenum. In particular, he pointed out that an acute shortage of spare parts and fuel has emerged this year not only in Poltava Oblast but also in other oblasts in the Ukrainian republic. Combines and truck are standing idle because of this, and elevators are holding up the delivery of grain. Approximately 1 million tonnes of grain are piled up today on Poltava's threshing floors.

The first secretary of Poltava party obkom voiced ideas about other problems in agricultural development and raised, inter alia, the question of social justice in the distribution of stockraising products.

The party's prestige, he continued, depends on all links but particularly on the primary party organization. We are taking every step to ensure that every party organization without exception has socially significant tasks to perform.

The oblast has begun to prepare for elections to the local soviets, the speaker stressed, taking into consideration the lesson of the recent elections of people's deputies.

While speaking about the social aspects, the speaker pointed out that the ill-fated soap and wash powder question has still not been resolved even today. We are ashamed to look a combine operator in the eye: He threshes 60 quintals of grain but he has nothing with which to wash his hands. We have already been talking about this for 2-3 months, but the matter is not being resolved.

Since there has been no legislation to determine local soviets' rights, possibilities, and functions, the Poltava Obkom first secretary continued, it is proving very difficult to fill vacancies for soviet personnel in the local organs, particularly for chairmen. The speech also touched on questions of nationalities policy and the subject of a bilingual press. There are cities in Poltava Oblast inhabited by many Russians, he said, while all the newspapers are published in Ukrainian. The speaker proposed that one-fourth of the press be published in Russian.

D.S. Yadgarov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Bukhara Obkom, took the floor. The period that our entire country is living through, he pointed out, is unusually crucial, and this requires very serious and strenuous work from all of us. But the party undoubtedly bears particular responsibility.

Life and the success of perestroyka insistently necessitate the speediest restoration of party prestige. It must be absolute. This is only possible if party committees express not only the needs of communists and the people's masses but are also able to organize the process of meeting those requirements efficiently, while ensuring the supreme political, organizational, and economic effectiveness of this process.

We are purposefully seeking forms and methods of organizing party work which correspond with the time, the speaker said. Few have been found. Certainly the CPSU Central Committee and the union republic communist party central committees have not aimed to make full use of their mighty potential to elaborate contemporary concepts in party-political work. The smallest fragments of experience in contemporary party work must be made available to all the country's party committees.

The speaker described the main avenues in the oblast party's organization's quest for innovations, notably the improvement of the style of party leadership, work with cadres, and the resolution of the most important socio-economic problems. We tried for a long time to hush up and skirt social problems, he pointed out, but they caught up with us again and barred our way. The resolution of these problems has assumed such depth and scale today that the outcome of this work is directly linked to the prestige and independence of the republic's party committees and soviet organs. Above all, it is a question of monoculture and of purchase prices for cotton. These problems must be resolved as quickly as possible. Groundless assurances only lessen the credit of trust in party, soviet, and state organs.

The speaker spoke excitedly about the most alarming shortage, that is, the shortage of trust among the people. The central task, he said, is to arouse public awareness in communists and all working people so that they act not as suppliants but as the general client and, together with

party committees, soviets, and economic leaders, as the contractor in the implementation of all the tasks with which we are faced.

The party, the speaker underlined, is the initiator and guarantor of restructuring. It is the CPSU which can defend restructuring against all manner of backlashes and bring the renewal of socialism to a successful conclusion.

We are all aware that the democratization of intraparty life is lagging behind the democratization of society, I.G. Postoronko, first secretary of the Ivano-Frankovsk Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, said. We are forced to speak in earnest today about the need to boost the prestige of primary party organizations and the party as a whole. With this in view, we are boosting the responsibility of party members, listening to reports, and holding conversations and certifications during which we clarify everyone's stance on restructuring. The primary party organizations have determined and are already resolving socially significant tasks.

Questions of communists' personal involvement in solving specific problems are being debated at party meetings.

The activity of party organizations is at the center of the mass media. In our concern to fill the party ranks with true champions of restructuring, we are devoting more attention to picking people for the party. We put it this way: Communist leaders, members of party committees, and the most prestigious and respected people are now involved in recommending people to the party and raising young communists.

Proceeding on the basis of the specific situation, a quest is under way for new forms of mass-political work. We were once again convinced of the need for this, the speaker said, by the results of the recent elections of USSR people's deputies. Information and propaganda groups, headed by members of party obkom, gorkom, and raykom bureaus, have been set up and are operating at party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms to offer practical aid to primary party organizations and conduct up-to-the-minute studies of the political situation. They are encountered in labor collectives, above all in those which are the source of acute questions and where an acute situation is taking shape.

The speech went on to note that the activation of representatives of the Uniate Church and their desire to legalize the Ukrainian Catholic Church, which compromised itself in the eyes of the Ukrainian people, has aroused particular disquiet recently. In this connection, verbal statements and newspaper articles indicate the reactionary essence of the Uniate Church and its alliance with nationalism and explain that the so-called Uniate question is no more than a cover for nationalism.

The exacerbation of the political situation in Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast and in all the western oblasts of the Ukraine in connection with the preparations for the 50th anniversary of their reunification with the USSR was stressed. These historical events, the speaker said, are being presented by pronationalist elements in a biased fashion.

The speech examined in detail the obkom's work with cadres. In the course of last year's reports and elections, 75 percent of party group organizers and secretaries of shop and primary party organizations and 25 percent of party gorkom and raykom secretaries in the oblast were elected on a contested basis. This process is being stepped up. In all the city and rayon party organizations it is the practice for bureau members to give reports at plenums and meetings in primary party organizations. People are only nominated for work in the party apparatus after examination of the candidacies in primary party organizations and labor collectives. In the last 18 months more than 100 party committee workers have reported on their activity in the collectives that recommended them.

Speaking about preparations for elections of people's deputies for the republic and local soviets, the speaker noted that the main thing here is the quest for real leaders, principled people who enjoy genuine prestige.

The rebirth of political life in the country is a fact that does not need proving, N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, noted. Its absolutely positive essence is oriented toward eliminating people's former routine indifference to social activity and emancipating the creative forces of the people, who were too long under the pressure of political conservatism. However, while loudly declaring the need for real dialogue between the people and the authorities and overcoming people's alienation from power, some of us leaders are totally unable to rid ourselves of the stereotyped negative attitude toward dissidence, which has worked its way into our blood.

The times of reassuring unanimity have gone forever, and with them the right to power without accountability for those leaders who hoped to continue to keep people's awakened activeness on a tight rein.

Surely the policy of deliberate compromise, tolerance, and willingness to fully understand the opposite side's interests, which enables us to conduct our international affairs successfully today, can also be used effectively to resolve equally complex internal problems? I am sure, the speaker stressed, that this is not only possible, but extremely necessary.

The speaker recalled V.I. Lenin's words that there is no need to fear a period of general debates. Among us, he noted, party and soviet leaders are not infrequently afraid of democratization and are prepared to see it as the main reason for the increasing social tension. The lack of trust from the people that the party feels today is

the result of our inability to listen to people and understand their specific needs and aspirations, our reluctance to protect them from everyday hardships.

The CPSU Central Committee's course of ridding itself of incompetent cadres is, in the speaker's view, entirely justified. It is necessary to think about further deepening this process at every level. If we can spare the people everyday routine bureaucracy, their trust in the party will increase sharply.

One of the prime concerns of party committees today is to remove the artificially created barriers on the path of economic reform and call strictly to account those Communists who, for the sake of their personal calm and well-being, sabotage it and bring to nothing the decisions adopted by the 19th party conference and the Congress of People's Deputies. The strengthening of discipline and responsibility for the fulfillment of decisions has become a serious problem.

Priority social problems must remain at the center of the party's attention, the speaker stressed, going on to analyze certain positive trends that have emerged in Kazakhstan.

We should learn, the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee first secretary said, to listen to the voice of the people and recognize gratefully those informal representatives of the people who boldly take on leadership functions. We should see many of them as a militant cadre reserve and entrust them boldly with responsible party, soviet, and economic work. It is time at last to abandon negative assessments of the activity of the press, which we ourselves called upon to be bolder in uncovering the old sores of the bureaucratic edict system. After all, the mass media genuinely reflect the objectively contradictory nature of the socioeconomic and moral processes taking place in society.

L.F. Bobykin, first secretary of Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom, took the floor. We have been waiting for this meeting for a long time, he said. Meetings are held in the oblast party organizations, and plenums of party raykoms and gorkoms, with this agenda: the party's role at the present stage. They are stormy. No one is indifferent during the discussion. Many interesting proposals are made to boost the party's prestige and increase the effectiveness of party work. There are criticisms of the obkom and the CPSU Central Committee.

Communists and working people speak with concern about the state of affairs in the economy, ideology, law and order, interethnic relations, intraparty life, and the exacerbation of negative processes. Indeed, things are not going at all how we had expected, or how they should.

The situation in the economy today is assessed as critical. It is true that the time that has elapsed is not sufficient to bring about profound changes in the economy. But it is also true that the reason for the further deterioration in the situation that has arisen should be sought in the actual processes taking place today.

The Law on the State Enterprise should be revised on the basis of experience, the speaker went on. It is even more urgently necessary to revise the Law on the Cooperative System, which is leading to speculative activity on the part of the majority of cooperatives. This activity meets with no legislative obstacles or objective economic restrictions in the market. It is time to stop labeling as conservatives and enemies of restructuring all those who are worried about whether the cooperative movement is going in the right direction.

Party influence on economic processes has recently declined sharply. On these matters we await a marked increase in the influence of the Central Committee Socioeconomic Department on the local situation, and also on the formulation of state decisions on economic questions. The reduction in the party apparatus that has taken place and the abolition of sector departments appear premature.

Still greater anxiety is caused by the state of affairs in ideological work. Party committees at every level bear responsibility for the fact that the forms and methods of ideological and educational work lag behind the rapid processes of democratization of life and politicization of the masses. At the same time, party organizations and communists urgently need guidance documents on the ideology, policy, and practice of restructuring. The lack of such documents in an integral and systematic form gives rise to uncertainty and confusion among ideological workers.

The mass media are the main means of ideological influence on people. But if there are still "closed zones" for criticism, they are the mass media themselves and their workers. The slightest comment or disagreement, and the party committee openly slanders you. The true picture of the work of the mass media sometiems leads not to consolidation, but to disunity, and distorts the line of restructuring.

The working person and the everyday working life of restructuring have virtually disappeared from literature, cinema, and television. They are full of "thieves within the law," prostitutes, drug addicts, hooligans, and dubious "supermen." We are morally corrupting our people, and again, first and foremost, the young.

It is time to draw the line between healthy pluralism of opinion and taste, and the propaganda of alien ideology, which openly corrupts society. Once again, we fully recognize our responsibility for the moral and political atmosphere, but we will be unable to make any substantial changes for the better, unless we receive firm support in the Central Committee's position on ideological questions and in the activity of the central mass media.

We see no firm line on ideological questions. We see vagueness and uncertainty in speeches, and businesslike meetings with ideological workers locally have virtually ceased.

It is necessary to inform the population more about the Politburo's activity. The role of the Central Committee Secretariat has been weakened recently. Obviously we need a Central Committee second secretary, whatever you call it officially.

Our responsibility is great. But much does not depend on us. It is not enough to declare priorities, which, incidentally, should in fact be scaled down on the basis of real potential. It is necessary to ensure the conditions for putting them into practice.

Questions of the party's prestige, work with cadres, and the style of party work were highlighted by V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, in his speech. We feel keenly, he said, that the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum gave the party a great vote of confidence, and the deepening of the process of radical restructuring—the radical economic reform and reform of the political system—added to these dividends. At the same time, in practice much is not turning out as one would wish. We see the people's dissatisfaction, we hear reproaches against the party, and we cannot help wondering: What are the reasons?

The reasons undoubtedly lie in the fact that despite all our efforts, we have not seen the marked shifts in the economy or the quality of life that the people expect from restructuring. People want real changes for the better, an improvement in living standards, more autonomy, more protection in life, and so forth.

We are having to work and gain experience in the completely new conditions of political pluralism. No new slogans help here. We can only increase our prestige through concrete action, and therefore the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee considers it to be its prime duty to have a program of action that really meets the republic's interests. That is why we have begun to act energetically to create, in particular, the real foundations of economic autonomy and republican economic accountability, ensure guarantees of the people's future, and stabilize society. This work is hampered if people look on it with distrust, and there have been accusations of separatism and of failing to take account of unionwide interests. But later, when you study everything calmly, it turns out that there is no deformation here.

The speaker put a request to the CPSU Central Committee: Always react calmly and with equanimity to initiative and new ideas, try to find grains of something useful in them, to generalize and support them. Unfortunately, the speaker said, the old stereotyped thinking is still strong among us. And the easiest thing of all is to reject out of hand everything that is not in accordance with that stereotype.

Speaking of the prestige of the party and its cadres, the speaker stressed that many movements and initiatives that have sprung up in the republic's public life have elected communists as their leaders. Therefore, he believes, the party has enormous reserves. It is necessary to take a new, fresh look at the recruitment of party cadres, but only on the basis of our party principles.

Going on to speak of the style and methods of party work, the speaker stressed that he was very pleased by the words "party comradeship" that appeared in the report. We have forgotten, he said, about the party ethos, party friendship, party comradeship. It is necessary to ensure that the party aktiv, which now feels under strong psychological pressure, works with enthusiasm. Therefore it is necessary to restore the Leninist style of party work in every way.

In the republic, the speaker said in conclusion, we do not intend to combine the posts of party committee secretaries and soviet chairmen, either at Supreme Soviet level or at the level of city and rayon soviets.

Life shows, V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Obkom, said, that the party's course of restructuring was and is the only correct course in accordance with the interests of the people and the state. To fail to see positive developments is to cut yourself off from reality and fail to feel the pulse of the times.

At the same time groups and groupings have come to the surface that, donning the garb of fighters for restructuring and armed with revolutionary phraseology, seek to exploit the nationwide renewal movement for their own self-seeking political ends. In the struggle for power, they try to create political instability, ungovernability, and permissiveness in the country, and want to put the blame for the difficulties that exist on the party and its leading bodies.

Ordinary communists and party and labor veterans ask openly why we do not rebuff anti-restructuring forces and give a principled assessment of their antiparty platforms. The question of renewing the party itself at a faster pace, democratizing its internal life, resolutely renouncing edict methods, and really handing over power to the local soviets has become urgent.

Our task is to go to people, to hold an honest and open discussion with the masses, and to convince them of the rightness and correctness of our course. It is necessary to arm party committees with the strategy and tactics of preemptive [operezhayushchiye] actions. The CPSU Central Committee must set an example in this. It is expedient to develop a partywide debate on the party's place and role in our society on the basis of clear-cut Marxist-Leninist principles. In the course of it party organizations will be able to resolutely purge themselves of the unworthy hangers-on who, under the guise of pluralism of opinions, openly oppose the party's Leninist organizational and ideological principles.

The question of arming communists with a scientifically substantiated concept of socialism, the party, and its place and role at the present stage of restructuring and in the renewed socialist society is acutely urgent. It is necessary to purposefully and consistently pursue the line of clearly delimiting the functions of party committees and soviet and economic organs, but in such a way that this does not affect the resolution of socioeconomic problems.

The problem of enhancing discipline is of particular concern to all healthy forces in society. This could entail unpredictable consequences unless urgent and decisive measures are taken.

The speaker supported the idea of holding the 28th party conference in the fall of 1990. On the whole, he said, preemptive initiative of thoughts and actions is more needed today than ever before. The democratization of people's power means not only the right of everyone to participate in the elaboration of decisions but, above all, a very high degree of organization, discipline, and responsibility before the people for their successful realization.

A.F. Ponomarev, first secretary of Belgorod CPSU Obkom, took the floor. I would like to speak with comradely straightforwardness and confidentiality, he said, about something that now concerns every party worker and every honest communist to the depth of his heart—about our party's prestige. The reassessment of historical values that is taking place in the country has directly affected not only its past but also present-day affairs. We do not tire of repeating that the party has assumed a heavy burden of responsibility for the serious blunders and mistakes made in the country's economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual life. But this is responsibility not only for the past but also for the future of the country, of restructuring, and of socialism and for the people's destiny.

What is needed for this is both stern self-criticism and uncompromising dismissal of those who compromise the high title of communist by their immoral actions. Our real achievements and the very essence of the Marxist teaching as a whole are unequivocally called in question both in the pages of the press and in the speeches of certain deputies at the recent congress, the speaker continued. This is not being done accidentally, I believe, but with a view to belittling the party's prestige and, in the final analysis, divorcing the party from the people. Under these conditions why do we not take, so it seems to me, proper measures in practice?

An undesirable trend has become apparent and is manifested both in the loss and defamation of cadres and in negative processes in the economy. I cannot keep quiet, the speaker said, about the sense of indignation aroused by the tactless attacks made at the Congress of People's Deputies on Ye.K. Ligachev, secretary of the party's Central Committee. We know him as an honest and highly principled politician who for many years headed both an oblast party organization and various sectors in the post of secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the Central Committee Politburo. I fully share the viewpoint of those deputies and those ordinary communists who evaluated the statements against Comrade Ligachev as nothing but a desire to cast aspersions on the entire Politburo and to discredit its leadership.

When assessing from principled positions the business and political qualities of a leader, regardless of the post that he holds, one must not be tactless and rude in assessing his work. Each of us has the right to social protection, including protection from farfetched accusations and assessments that denigrate us.

The speaker went on to express concern over the state of labor, social, and production discipline in the country. I believe, he said, that we underestimate the Leninist requirements to reinforce the development of democracy by beefing up discipline. Misconceptions of democratic rights and freedoms lead to the result that some people seek via rallies, strikes, and demonstrations to pressure party, soviet, and economic leaders and to gratify their own egotistic, narrow, and even ethnic ambitions.

Speaking about the lessons of the last election campaign and about the preparations for the local soviet elections, the speaker voiced the opinion that in the last election campaign there was too much parading of democracy, idle talk, and philistine, narrow-minded animosity toward local party leaders. It is necessary, the speaker said, to assert the party's prestige by involving the party more widely in the genuine democratization process and by restructuring internal party life on Leninist principles.

Ours is a very complex region requiring extraordinary solutions, Ya.P. Pogrebnyak, first secretary of Lvov Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, said. Today, people who have lost faith in many things particularly need new confidence in party organizations at the local level and in the CPSU as a whole. It is necessary to reveal and use more fully the reserves existing in every region and to use more levers to make better use of tthe erritories' potential.

A program for the oblast's comprehensive socioeconomic development for 1989-1995 and through the year 2000 has been drawn up in this vein. It is geared toward satisfying social questions more fully. This makes it possible to converse with people more concretely. It is a good basis for developing regional economic accountability.

The restructuring processes, the speaker continued, are developing so fast that it is constantly necessary to correct the ideas about them, the actions, and even the concepts. Unfortunately, this is frequently done belatedly. Clearly, we should, he believes, formulate and amplify in the light of practice the ideological, economic, and social aims of restructuring and reinterpret and concretize individual points concerning the party's place and role in this process. This will impart confidence in work and mobilize party forces.

Broader collective counsel with communists and nonparty people and a corresponding mechanism for their participation in this dialogue are needed. Only such an approach can be the basis for the elaboration of documents for the 28th party congress. I believe, the speaker said, that we must not be in a hurry over the congress but should prepare thoroughly for it.

Questions of the party's ideological activity are becoming particularly acute. The rapid politicization of public awareness as a whole is positive. At the same time, as already stated here, destructive criticism, sharp attacks on the party and on socialism, and speculation on problems of ethnic relations and religion are gathering momentum. This perplexes individual party workers and communists. More clear-cut recommendations from the CPSU Central Committee are needed here, the speaker pointed out.

Analyzing relations with informal associations in detail, the speaker said, in particular, that in western regions of the country there are difficulties connected with rally democracy, with symbols, and with the so-called samizdat. Legal norms and decisive measures are needed in this sphere.

The opinion has been expressed recently, the speaker said, that the processes of democratization, glasnost, and improvement of work style and methods under way in the party are lagging behind the processes occurring in society. Party life really must be more dynamic, as the times demand. It must be governed by more modern statutes whose provisions must be more flexile and take into account the rapidly changing operating conditions of party committees and organizations.

A proposal was made on the expediency of adopting such a form of assessing the activeness of party members as the suspension or cessation of membership for those who do not actively carry out the restructuring processes. The speech also examined aspects of the relationship between the party organization and labor collectives.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took the floor.

It is 4 years since the April plenum of the party's Central Committee, the speaker said. We have every reason to maintain that the party has implemented a turnaround in domestic and foreign policy. It has spoken boldly of its weaknesses and mistakes, formulated the policy of restructuring, and defined the strategy and tactics of socialist renewal.

Now, during the practical implementation of the reform, the timing, pace, and depth of restructuring processes, the correlation between economic and political transformations, and the role and place of the party have assumed particular importance. As you know, we have sometimes promised in our statements, with the best possible intentions, of course, that positive changes will arrive quickly. Specifically, it has been said that it is planned to eliminate difficulties in food supply within 2 years and that it is planned to reach world standards in the production of machine-building output as early as the end of the current 5-year plan.

Life has shown otherwise. It takes long years to raise such a vast country as ours to a qualitatively new level. I am not referring to urgent matters, of course, such as the production of personal hygiene products. The fact that our powerful state is beset by this kind of shortage is an utter disgrace. I am referring to profound transformations of society, which will take a long time.

In order to avoid making mistakes in politics, it is necessary to proceed from realities. In this context I would like to say the following. For many years the country has been burdened by vast military expenditure. A considerable proportion of the country's production and intellectual potential—and what is more, the best part of it—has been geared to reinforcing our defense potential. Note that in 1985 military output accounted for almost 40 percent of production at defense plants and in the machine-building complex. In my opinion, in this situation a restructuring of the economy attaining world levels of quality and the solution of priority social tasks within a short period are simply impossible. It seems to me that the one rules out the other.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary went on to say that the country has achieved military-strategic parity at enormous expense; this had to be done. It is true, as has now emerged, that there have also been excesses [perebory]. However, taking an overall view, it is perfectly obvious that without the party's skillful foreign policy and without military-strategic parity the positive changes which have taken place in the international situation could not have occurred. Only now, when the disarmament process and the transition from confrontation to cooperation have begun, have real opportunities emerged for switching a substantial part of the potential of the defense sectors of industry and of so-called big-league science to civilian purposes.

I am firmly convinced, and I would like to repeat: It is impossible to sustain such great military expenditure while simultaneously implementing radical restructuring of the economy and resolving cardinal social problems. Without the broad involvement of the defense industry complex in the production of means of production it is impossible to substantially boost the economy.

As is known, defense sectors of industry have now been entrusted with important tasks in raising the technological standard of civilian sectors. I will cite just one example—machine building for the food industry. It is planned to start up the production of more than 3,000 models of equipment during 1988-1995. Six months have passed, a relatively long time. Yet only 30 types of machinery and equipment have been developed and put

into production. The conversion of the military industry is not a simple task. A state program is needed.

Naturally, this is not our only reserve, nor even the most important one. The main thing is the economic reform, the new system of management.

Furthermore, Ye.K. Ligachev said, I would like to stress with the utmost clarity that our duty is to take care of our glorious army, provide it with good-quality weapons, improve its material and living conditions, strengthen the army's prestige in society, not separate it into national compartments, and, without fail, protect it from all kind of attacks.

As is well known, perestroyka has brought the problem of the food market to the fore. The situation has deteriorated as a result of the fact that the state has begun to lose control over the growth of incomes. Meanwhile food production is increasing only slowly.

Practice shows that the political objectives outlined by the Central Committee March plenum are correct. I recall the remark of a peasant from Kozly village in Kaluga Oblast made in the course of a conversation: "Now that great latitude has been given to peasants, the situation in the countryside will improve."

The party's activity within the agro-industrial complex has been focused on fundamental changes in production relations and on diversity and equality of different forms of socialist ownership and management, and the quickest ways of alleviating the acute situation in food supplies to the population within the next few years have been outlined. They include economic acocuntability, leasing, cooperatives, the development of family farms, storage and processing of agricultural output, creation of a modern food industry, and production sharing between industrial and agricultural enterprises in agricultural production.

At the same time many comrades express dissatisfaction with the decisions that were adopted. Why? What is the matter?

The point is that with a 19-percent increase in capital investments in the agro-industrial complex, it is planned to increase the production of foodstuffs by 26-30 percent. Such a correlation between the capital investments and output growth rates is unprecedented in the history of 5-year plans in both the agrarian and the industrial sectors of the national economy.

The growth of capital investments has always greatly outstripped the increases in food production. Incidentally, the same correlation between investments in means of production and output growth exists in socialist countries. I have studied these questions in Czechoslovakia and Hungary where, as is well known, the population is fully self-sufficient in regard to food production.

In our country, the speaker said, peasants are considerably worse off regarding both technical equipment and social amenities. What is galling is this. The draft plan for the development of the agro-industrial complex for the coming year was submitted by the State Planning Committee [Gosplan] a few days ago at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Policy Commission. It contains lower indicators than envisaged in the 5-Year Plan regarding both capital investments and material and technical resources, and also the commissioning of processing enterprises. While lip service is paid to the priority of the food problem, the resources to solve this problem are actually being cut back. Naturally, the CPSU Central Committee Commission recommended that the 1990 plan be brought into line with the current 5-Year Plan. Otherwise, the Central Committee March plenum is threatened with the same fate that befell many previous plenums devoted to agrarian problems.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary went on to share his thoughts about strengthening the role of the party as the key link in the implementation of the policy of renewal and also about the political situation in society. The report mentioned, he said, that a tense situation has developed in the country and that interethnic relations have deteriorated. It is necessary to add to this that opposition antiperestroyka political organizations with their own publications are being formed. What is more, it can be said that in some places a dyarchy is developing. Political careerists have jumped onto the bandwagon of democratization.

A lively debate is currently under way in society about the position of the party and about waning trust in the party as a result of the poor solution of social problems. I believe that it is necessary to add here that in a number of regions of the country a situation has developed where people are afraid for their safety, for their children's lives, and for the country's future. Naturally, they are asking themselves: What kind of socialist state is this if it is incapable of guaranteeing its citizens personal security and a tranquil life? Why is all this happening, and where are we heading?

The exacerbation of contradictions in society and people's agitation also have other causes, in my opinion.

We have to bear in mind that the way to improve all spheres of society is by overcoming the difficulties which are rooted in the past and the present and affect the interests of everyone. During major turning points in society's development such as perestroyka, before the upturn, when the country is at a critical stage, there is a buildup of contradictions. Such is the logic of development. The situation is, of course, also affected by the serious shortcomings in the work of central and local party and state organs. It must be admitted with the utmost responsibility that our bad work, bureaucracy, and leaders' alienation from people present a greater

danger than the antisocialist elements. Although they too must be resolutely rebutted, relying on the law and labor collectives.

Another point. The continuity of policy has been weakened in the process of perestroyka. In many instances, we fail to make use of valuable experience accumulated by the party during the period of building socialism.

The denunciation of Stalin's personality cult and its pernicious consequences and also of the stagnation phenomena in society have cleared the path for democratization, working people's initiative, and the enhancement of their role in the management of the state. And the people have duly appreciated this. However, at the same time a campaign has been launched to slander everything that Soviet people hold dear and to negate the role of the party and the work of whole generations of communists. The history of our country has always served as a source of pride for our people and a source of strength, especially in the most difficult times. Now they have largely been deprived of this.

The task is to place our history in the service of Soviet society and its interests. Incidentally, our friends abroad have an equally great need of this.

In order to really rectify the mistakes that have been made and to ensure that there is more socialism in society, we must more rapidly improve the party's internal life, change the style, methods, forms, and modes of practical activity by party committees, resolutely cease being office-bound in our work, mingle with people, show concern for them, and exert the requisite influence.

There is no place for carelessness and unconcern here. It has been said at the conference that there is a shortage of guidelines from the party Central Committee. Maybe so. But often the crux lies elsewhere, perhaps in the fact that sometimes little is done to implement those guidelines both at central and local levels.

He went on to cite two examples. It is well known that, despite M.S. Gorbachev's important statement that no day in our history has been lived in vain, many publications and television have portrayed and continue to portray the 70th anniversary of October as a sequence of the most "terrible years." Recently there was a television speech by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on questions connected with nationalities policy and interethnic relations. How did certain regions respond? They responded with clashes and people's deaths. Surely this is evidence that we have not been vigorous enough in implementing the party Central Committee's perfectly correct and right guidelines.

Separation of the functions of party and state has begun. However, as has often happened with reforms and innovations, we lack patience and want immediate results. The soviets have not yet been endowed with the necessary rights and resources, but in a number of places party committees have already adopted a stance of nonintervention and neutrality and have withdrawn from the solution of economic and social problems. In this connection I would like to say the following. There can be an increase in the soviets' role in society only if the party is strengthened, and not at the expense of its weakening, as certain people propose. And the various proposals—for placing the party beneath the control of the soviets—are both politically and juridically untenable.

It must be borne in mind that the CPSU is above all the party of the working class, and any restriction on it signifies belittling and weakening of the role of the working class—the decisive force within society. A correct decision has been made to convene a workers' congress in the very near future.

Recently there have been calls for a multiparty system. In conditions of a federative state such as the Soviet Union, this is simply fatal. A multiparty system would mean the disintegration of the Soviet federation. And that is natural, because the Communist Party is the only real political force that rallies and unites all the country's peoples into a united union of republics. And there is no other way.

An important place in all work connected with strengthening the party's leading role is occupied by active participation by every communist in perestroyka, the level of party discipline, and strict compliance with the party statutes. A great deal that is alarming and even dangerous has emerged here. We have now reached a point where, clearly, it is necessary to adopt a resolution on consolidating the unity of party ranks and strengthening party discipline and the unconditional fulfillment of the requirements of the statutes on the basis of broad democratization of internal party life, for without conscious discipline there is no political party. It is still possible to rectify this today; tomorrow it will be more difficult.

A great deal has been said about the mass news media here. The mass news media play a great role in the party's organizational and ideological activity. That is common knowledge, so there is no point in developing the thought. They are working solidly in the field of perestroyka. Admittedly, in different ways. There are some things here that it is really impossible to agree with. Diktat by certain groups reigns in certain news organs and there is in fact no pluralism or democracy there. Moreover, there are calls for the mass media to be removed from party control and to be transformed, so they say, into an independent force. What does this mean? It is not hard to answer that question. In that case the mass media would become a dictatorship in which certain forces ruled.

Now, where practical actions are the most important thing, the organizing role of our press has been weakened, unfortunately. Creative actions by the press, of which we have accumulated tremendous experience, are regarded virtually as bad form, virtually as a throwback

to stagnation. Another idea that has gained currency is that the press and television merely reflect life the way it is. What are you demanding of us, they say. Life is like that; we merely reflect it in the press.

By reflecting and showing life and developing criticism in every possible way, the mass news media are called upon to shape public opinion and to constructively influence society's cause. Specific steps must be taken on this score. It is now simply impossible to get away merely with general talk, of which we have no shortage.

In conclusion Ye.K. Ligachev noted that the political situation in the country is complex. There is criticism of the Politburo. Critical remarks are also being made about the person who is addressing you now. Expressing his attitude toward the criticism of him, the speaker stressed that he accepts healthy criticism for what it is, openly. But there is criticism, and there is slander. Feeling gravely worried about our blunders and the general state within the party, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, I strive to do everything possible together with you and local party organizations to solve society's most burning problem—the country's food supply—and to implement a modern agrarian policy. I strive always to adopt a clear position on all acute political issues.

Firmness of spirit, restraint, and realism in assessments are especially necessary in our turbulent time. Of course, restraint has nothing in common with either confusion or carelessness and unconcern.

Let us, the speaker urged, always remember that people judge us and our party on the basis of real actions, and this must be the main criterion in assessing each of us.

A little over 2 years ago at the 20th All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Congress we tried to define a program for our work, V.I. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, said. Now we can see that the program was, by and large, correctly defined. Describing what has been done, the speaker noted that as yet Komsomol members are joining only feebly in perestroyka and practical action. Debates, discussions, and arguments are in full swing, but by no means everywhere do they connect with real life, with the problems that are vital to young people, he pointed out; this is probably the biggest problem today, and a solution to it must be found.

The speaker is worried by the fact that there is a lack of clarity and definition in certain key concepts, For instance, in concepts such as the Komsomol's relationship with the party. Ideas of partnership with the party are being put forward and expressed everywhere, including in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and the principle of democratic centralism, the need for discipline within the league, and a great deal else are being disputed.

We must not lose the political initiative, the first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee continued. We have something to build on, we have the experience accumulated over 2 and ½ years, and we can and must analyze that experience. He announced the possibility of holding of the 21st Komsomol Congress next year.

The speaker recalled that during the first years of Soviet power the party recognized that it would work with young people primarily and exclusively via the Komsomol. In his opinion, the more widely the democratization of society unfolds, the firmer the connection between the party and the Komsomol must be. The party needs the Komsomol, V.I. Mironenko said, and the party values its readiness to be with the party always and in any situation. The majority of Komsomol members want consolidation; they want to unite in order to be real helpers and not a burden.

The thought was expressed that theoretical work in the party is lagging behind. Communists ought to be the most consistent champions of democracy, the defense of national cultures, humanism, and charity. Communists must never allow anyone to take over this role. Young people, the first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee said, cannot understand why all this is ceasing to be communists' weapon, and is sometimes becoming a weapon against them. It is necessary to travel the path of democratization, to travel the path of economic reform, and to defend perestroyka through word, law, and deed.

No ruling party can have an easy life, A.-R.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, said. Our own party certainly does not have it easy, heading the great power it does. It probably would be possible to live an uncomplicated life and continue as we have done in the past, but the strength and the worth of the CPSU leadership lies in the fact that it has advanced the idea of restructuring and new thinking and is leading this process.

Everywhere we see attempts to persistently instil the idea that nothing has been done under restructuring, while what has been done or is being done is either criticized or glossed over in silence. A particularly persistent, purposeful attack is being waged against the party.

For all our criticism, restructuring has done us a lot of good. It is enough to point to the enormous amount of work to develop the priority areas of restructuring, the implementation of political and economic reform that has now begun, the very important social programs, and the invaluable successes in international activity.

All this has been made possible solely because the party called for restructuring and took the lead in this process. But it has become fashionable to say that the past 4 years of restructuring have been time wasted for no purpose. I cannot agree with that. But there is still much we have to do! That is why we will continue to support the policy of

criticism, but we must wage a determined struggle against slander and groundless criticism of the past and present of our country and party.

The progress of the struggle under way in our country and the logic of restructuring, the speaker continued, require us to further strengthen the role of the CPSU as the political vanguard. We have not renounced and are not thinking of renouncing our role as the ruling party, and that is why we must fight to strengthen this role. First, because a lot of effort is being made to drive a wedge between the party and the people and undermine the authority of the party leadership. Second, the authority and role of the leader must daily be confirmed by real action. There are two tasks here, in my view: the unity of the party, the strengthening of its ranks, and the development of internal party democracy; and second, the stabilization of the situation in the country through the most vigorous resolution of the problems of socioeconomic development and of strengthening law and order and the rule of law.

The Azerbaijan Communist Party first secretary believes that we must urge communists, the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia to resolutely rise in the defense of socialism and provide firm guarantees that restructuring is irreversible. People must be brought together in joint practical action for the good of the nation.

Nothing works more for the authority of the party, the speaker stressed, than active intervention in resolving the urgent socioeconomic and moral problems troubling the people. He went on to give examples confirming this idea and discussed measures to strengthen the militancy of the republic's party organization.

Touching on the subject of the forthcoming elections to local soviets, the speaker voiced a number of ideas, pointing out in particular that there must be a legislative guarantee that workers and peasants are worthily represented in the soviets.

He devoted part of his speech to analyzing relations with informal associations. In his opinion, the party organization must actively cooperate with associations that have a constructive program. The various groupings which have set themselves totally unacceptable, antirestructuring aims and are waging an open struggle for political power are another matter. I have met some of their representatives. They have no real arguments and no real program of action. They flatly refuse any suggestion that they take part in resolving specific tasks for the good of the people. The attitude to associations like these must be as follows: We must draw up our own program of action with regard to extremist groups, those which have no qualms about openly calling for the destruction of the country.

The floor was given to N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The party and the state, he said, are in an extremely difficult situation. I think this is a realistic assessment, and I put the party first in this assessment, because, with regard to the situation that has taken shape within the state, the outlines of many of the problems were described and the aspects of domestic and foreign policy were formulated by M.S. Gorbachev at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

But as far as the party is concerned there is no such clarity at the moment. Especially as until recently neither the Politburo nor a Central Committee plenum had given a detailed, comprehensive assessment of the condition in which the party now finds itself. But many events, particularly in recent months, show that negative phenomena are showing increased growth within this powerful political organization.

What is shown by the conclusions we can draw? First and foremost, so many accusations have been brought against the party both in our own country and abroad—more than it has ever had brought against it in the entire history of its existence—that it is in fact losing authority in the eyes of the people. In every one of us this arouses a feeling of bitterness that things have happened in this way and—there is no point hiding it—prompts attempts to justify all this by referring to past mistakes and the need for a process of purification. That is the first point.

Second, the entire course of developing events shows that, having in fact lost influence, authority, and the possibility to exert an influence on everything taking place in society, willingly or not we are still preserving the appearance that nothing out of the ordinary has happened, that the main levers are still in our hands, and that we can use them, as ever, to control the complex processes developing in the country by the same methods.

Third, it takes no special insight to see that in a number of republics federative trends are beginning to show in the construction and operation of party organizations, which will be a very dangerous step not only for the party but also for the integrity of the state.

Fourth, the authority of party cadres and the party's regional committees and primary organizations is being undermined before our very eyes.

So, why is this happening? After all, it was at the initiative and under the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee that restructuring began in April 1985. Transformations began in the economy, and glasnost and democracy were actively developed. Within 2 years it was obvious that stagnation phenomena in society were holding back economic reform and that there had to be a decisive rejection of firmly entrenched dogmas and stereotypes concerning the development of the political system. We have tackled all this and devoted the closest possible attention to it.

And in these 2 years the growing wave of transformations in the economy, democratization, glasnost, and the birth of new, informal social institutions began to overtake those insignificant changes on which the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo decided to embark in the sphere of party relations, the structure of the party apparatus, and party life as a whole.

Some republic Communist Party Central Committees and local party bodies, working on the basis of the old standpoints and the old forms and methods of work, have certainly not keyed into everything taking place in the real world in the last 18 months. They still retain a sacred belief in their own authority and in the unshakable, binding nature of the directives and decisions they adopt. But life shows that this is not valid.

Having played the leading role in the administrative-edict system of management, with the dismantling of this system the party is losing its main feature—the possibility to give direct instructions and interfere, as it has in the past, in questions of economic life, soviet building, and much more which, given the party's nature as a political organization, has always been unnatural.

What follows from what I have said? The first and most important point is that the party Central Committee has not made its position totally clear in the strategy of restructuring CPSU activity in the new conditions—from the lower links right up to the central apparatus—and it is obvious that today's discussion should have taken place much earlier.

Further, the process of self-purification which was necessary in the party has largely been reduced to self-flagellation and often to open castigation of party bodies and the party as a whole in oral, written, caricature, and other forms—everywhere and on an increasing scale.

No less alarming is the fact that we have begun to lose our influence and our control of the situation taking shape in certain regions of the country. Belief in our strength and the infallibility of decisions evolved has led to a serious underestimation of the situation. The main underestimation is the hope that everything will work itself out in interethnic issues, in the massive antisocial demonstrations, in the leadership of the mass media, and in the selection, placement, and training of cadres.

It is especially necessary, the speaker went on to say, to single out major miscalculations in ideology. Inertia on the part of the corresponding departments and party Central Committee secretaries in this very important sphere of party activity results —and this must be said outright—in the increasing deideologization of society.

The next conclusion which stems directly from an analysis of the processes taking place in the economy and the social sphere consists, in my opinion, in the fact that we have not really restructured all party work since the 19th party conference. Yet this was in effect the most powerful charge in our party life in the recent period.

Lastly, we must see clearly that the attitude to party organs in many strata of the population has fluctuated. Things are reaching the point where the party is being relegated to a backseat in public life. This was shown by the elections. I am expressing my opinion, Comrades: In my view, we must acknowledge that the assessment made after the elections is not quite accurate. We overestimated statistics, citing the fact that 85 percent of the elected deputies are communists. This quantitative majority for party members is little indication. Many of them do not have a clear position on the main question, which is frequently heard in speeches and is linked with attempts to reduce the party's leading role in society's life and cast doubt on its role as society's political core.

To this we must add the fact that we came unprepared to the elections. Our party platform was certainly very strong and met with a good response from the people. But various dubious informal candidates proved more organized, acted more vigorously, and really fought for the voters' mandate. At the same time, while possessing vast opportunities, the party has in effect let this matter slide in many areas by occupying a purely pro forma position. Here once again faith in its former prestige and in the infallibility and absolutism of the recommendations given to the people was at work.

We were also not quite prepared for the congress. Here we allowed the activeness of certain groups, including those representing informal organizations, to be underestimated. They literally forced their way to the rostrum with their platforms, programs, proposals, and accusations, including often direct insinuations against the party. But the Politburo found itself on the sidelines, in an isolated position, as if under the influence of some cataleptic syndrome. No one from the Politburo spoke, as is well known, at the congress. Only two Politburo members—Gorbachev and Ryzhkov—spoke from its rostrum by virtue of the congress standing orders.

Why did the others not go to the rostrum with their standpoints and their opinions and why did they fail to express their attitude to everything that was being said about the CPSU? I believe that this was our strategic miscalculation. However paradoxical this may seem, the party was mainly defended at the congress by workers, while some CPSU obkom secretaries even dissociated themselves from the subject in their speeches.

As a Central Committee Politburo member, I must particularly dwell on something that is now arousing serious concern. The congress and the session showed that the structural changes which have taken place in the Central Committee are clearly inadequate. We need more fundamental changes. We must now find new approaches, new methods, and new principles in relations within the triangle which has emerged today in the

system of government—this triangle comprises the party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers.

Under the conditions of a USSR Supreme Soviet constantly in session and with constitutional powers, the functions previously exercised by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and CPSU Central Committee Politburo with regard to the elaboration of concepts for the country's economic development, the formation of 5-year and annual plans, and the adoption of decisions on state programs and so on are becoming unclear.

Direct recommendations on questions of economic building, economic reform, scientific and technical policy, and many other things can no longer be made solely at party level. The practice of the past few months has shown that neither the USSR Supreme Soviet, nor its commissions and committees, will accept such recommendations. In short, a real and mighty power has appeared in the shape of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet. We cannot fail to take this into consideration. If the party does not find a way out of this situation, it could lose its influence on state government.

Relations conducive to the harmonious combination of political, legislative, executive, and managerial power must be found. If the party overlooks this, the slogan advanced by some people—"Soviets without communists"—may be close to reality, and Article 6 of the USSR Constitution will be changed so that the party's role is nullified legislatively.

It is now clear, in our opinion, that attempts to act in the old way will be fruitless. New approaches are necessary to ensure that the party remains in the vanguard of perestroyka. We must think very seriously about what to do. A vague situation has emerged at the center today in relations between the CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers. Tomorrow, after elections have been held in the republics and the localities, it will be manifest throughout the country, giving rise to the same vagueness at republic, kray, and oblast level and consequently to uncertainty in action.

This is all the more dangerous under conditions where there is no clear line as to which processes are needed now to boost party prestige, strengthen its ranks, improve the apparatus, and impart new functions to it. Primarily as a result of this, it seems, some confusion has been observed in the party apparatus. Hence the recommendations which are being made to the localities to the effect that they do not have to wait for directives and must act for themselves as circumstances require. These recommendations lead to a situation where passions have not subsided in many regions and they are destabilizing the situation in the country. We must, of course, take effective political decisions and serious steps in order to prevent such instability within the state.

As a member of the Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers I was subjected to serious criticism at the congress and at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The criticism was impartial, exceptionally sharp, and serious, but for the most part just, constructive, and necessitating concrete action. While listening to everything that was said about me, I caught myself thinking that I was insufficiently self-critical in some cases. Yet there were mistakes and miscalculations, not only of an objective but of also of a subjective nature. In the 6 weeks that I have been confronting people's deputies, I became fully aware of the nature of a cleaning out process. Fundamental conclusions will be drawn from all of this concerning a substantial improvement in the work of the government and in my personal work.

It is of course difficult, but I will have to revise in many respects my views and approaches to what has been and what is to be done. I agree that we have hitherto failed to resolve basic economic problems and that this will have an impact on the general political situation in the country. I think that the new government, which was formed yesterday, must draw very, very serious conclusions. Of course, it must also work on an economic development strategy, while at the same time not shirking current affairs.

I believe that we—that is, every member of the Politburo and every member of the CPSU Central Committee, must review how we are working and the effectiveness of our actions. In other words every man must start with himself, with his obligations, and with the contribution he is making to the common cause. Given the importance of the problems is it permissible, for instance, that two members of the Politburo should study the problems of the countryside? I think not. We must look at the distribution of duties for the whole membership of the Politburo and the Central Committee Secretariat and assess whether the appropriate sector of the party leadership is successfully performing its task.

I would particularly like to say that we must do everything to help ensure that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee, devotes more attention to his party duties. We must free him from trivial questions, which are bogging him down. We must give him an opportunity to concentrate on fundamental problems, on which the party's present and future depend. He must be directly in charge of the most important matter of restructuring the CPSU. No one else can do this.

I believe that it is quite inadmissible that there is no sign of a clear line in many acute situations and that negative phenomena are not being repulsed. All manner of scum has risen to the surface on the wave of the healthy processes in society. It is harmful and we are not reacting to it. We are, as it were, giving tacit consent to democratic unions, dubious rallies—and many other similar manifestations. If any decision is made, the people do not notice our active position and opinion on this without extensive publicity. We are not acting in organic linkage with these processes; we are not doing everything

necessary to change people's social consciousness and support the healthy principles in society.

All of us here in this hall bear direct responsibility for what our party is: the real political core of a renewed society, its vanguard, or one political organization in a multiparty system, the shoots of which are beginning to appear with increasing vigor in the form of various informal unions, fronts, and other such movements. Things have not yet reached the point where the slogan "Party in Danger" is justified. But if we face up to the truth, we must clearly see that this possibility does exist and the role and prestige of the party must be enhanced in all manner of ways on the basis of restructuring within the party.

Great efforts are necessary, above all to overcome sluggishness, pragmatism, and all manner of abstract phenomena with regard to the party center and the localities. All this can only be done on the basis of radical perestroyka of the forms, methods, and approaches in party activity. The people's trust cannot be won otherwise. It is time to go to the people, not only with speeches and appeals regarding the need for concrete actions and major changes, but also in order to make them really take charge of these matters. Having roused the people to the fight, the party must head this struggle in every concrete area of the most difficult and very complex everyday work, the main significance of which is as an effective political guarantee of the attainment of the goals that have been mapped out.

I believe that M.S. Gorbachev's report and the debate that has unfolded on this question, which is of very great importance for the life of the party, give us grounds for elaborating concrete steps to restructure the activity of our society's vanguard.

Life has convincingiy confirmed that our restructuring is of a truly revolutionary character, Yu.A. Manayenko, first secretary of Lipetsk party obkom, indicated. As is well known, in any revolution, the main question is the question of power. In the speaker's view, it is precisely this that has provoked the acute clash of opinions in the country.

Voicing his opinion of the role of the CPSU in our activity and the forms and methods of its activity, the speaker stressed that the Central Committee has correctly defined the party's role as the political vanguard of the Soviet people. But I think, he continued, that this definition is not always clear enough in the mass media, propaganda, and the ordinary person's mind.

Against this backdrop, the speaker thought it exceptionally important to ensure that the party increases its attention to cadre selection, placement, and education. He voiced the conviction that Vladimir Ilich Lenin was correct 100 times over when he affirmed that, if the Central Committee loses its right to deal with the placement of personnel, it will be unable to direct policy.

In the speaker's view, political leadership has, to a certain extent, been weakened in our country by the mass media and propaganda.

I do not share the opinion, he said, that there is too much criticism in the press and on television and that criticism must be given in limited doses. I do not agree with statements which say that the press must be almost the partner of the party while sometimes also finding itself in opposition to it. The press must work under the leadership of the party and under the leadership of its collectives.

Speaking about the distribution of functions between party, state, and economic organs and about investing the soviets with full power, the speaker noted that the soviets cannot fulfill the role we have allotted them without the corresponding economic foundation. He reckons that there is still a considerable hiatus between words and actions. In his opinion, this is because we often forget about Lenin's demand for collegial discussion and individual responsibility for the implementation of plans. The lack of proper supervision of plan execution is alarming, in the speaker's opinion, because it often leads to alteration of the priorities determined by the party's leading organs.

A number of proposals were also voiced. In particular, according to the speaker, it makes sense to set up a special body within the Central Committee to coordinate the activity of party organizations functioning in the autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts of the Russian Federation. Definite changes must, he believes, be made to the Law on the State Enterprise. The party's theoretical establishments must voice a more definite and specific opinion on the role of the CPSU under conditions of restructuring and the democratization of society. A scientific concept for ideological work must be created as quickly as possible. A number of laws or decrees must also be adopted, reliably defending our economic structures and channeling people more effectively into highly-productive and high-quality labor.

The floor was given to A.M. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

Describing the complex political situation in the republic, he raised a number of questions which must be solved at CPSU Central Committee and government level.

They include the question of restoring Lenin's principles on the formation of the USSR and the status of individual union republics. This is already being talked about aloud. We are building a rule-of-law state, and we must establish once and for all times what the meaning is of this unique country, the USSR?

We have set up a Constitutional Commission for the country, and our republic has also drafted a Constitution. The draft has been published. Now the question of its further discussion and approval is in abeyance

because this work must certainly be done in parallel with the elaboration of a new Union Constitution.

The speaker urged the earliest possible adoption of the Law on the Economic Autonomy of Lithuania and Estonia. The Latvians are also virtually ready for it. Draft laws have been handed over to the USSR Supreme Soviet. We realize, the speaker said, that the adoption of this law will place on us, on the republican party organization, a very great responsibility for the implementation of the Law on Economic Autonomy. But I must say that we are ready for it.

Life shows that, in order to ensure that our economy functions efficiently, we, the leadership organs, must efficiently resolve the questions posed before us by communists and working people.

The second question concerns the status of the republic's Communist Party. It is being acutely raised by the public. In the speaker's view, it is necessary to decide the nature of the republic Communist Party, define its rights, and resolve organizational, structural, staff, and financial problems with due consideration for the specific and original features of the region. It has been announced that the Lithuanian Communist Party has already opened a debate on these problems.

It is a pleasing fact, Lithuania's party leader emphasized, that young communists, and especially academic youth, the professorial body, and the intellectual stratum, are really concerned about the party's future, the prospects for our future life, and the position to be occupied by the party in the entire political system in the republic and the Soviet Union.

At the present stage of perestroyka in the country's development there are processes which are negative for the party, and these processes are unfortunately deepening, B.M. Volodin, first secretary of Rostov party obkom, noted. Without dramatizing the situation but analyzing what is taking place, one would conclude that all these processes are, in one way or another, associated with the CPSU's activity, the specific features of its present condition, and the changes in the population's attitudes to the party, its individual structures, and communists in leadership positions. This, the speaker emphasized, is probably happening because, while rejecting the party's role of leadership by edict, we have failed to create a suitable structure of soviets which must take power in their hands. In addition to the definite trend toward a decline in the party's prestige, the prestige of the soviets of people's deputies, the trade unions, the Komsomol, and other public organizations is also declining, and this poses a real threat to the implementation of the party's vanguard role.

It is necessary to build a draft model of the new society, submit it for nationwide discussion, and plan the stages and measures for the building of this model only after it has been accepted. I do not support those comrades, the speaker went on, who advocate the imposition of bans on topics for publication by the mass media. I am, however, profoundly convinced of one thing: There must be some regulation of what should be printed in the mass circulation press and what should appear in scientific journals. The blame here lies not with the press but with those who guide it.

We often talk at length about the fact that the prestige of any social organ, including the party, is gained through deeds, the first secretary of Rostov CPSU Obkom remarked. Not by any deed, however, but only by deeds in which our people are interested. This is why it is necessary to clearly define these interests, draw schedules for their implementation, and allocate specific jobs among party and soviet organs and other social formations.

The situation demands the application of flexible political methods and, naturally, new qualitative standards for party committees' work and also improved leadership by higher-ranking party organs, the speaker went on to say. I also apply this to the party Central Committee apparatus.

The speaker supported the proposal to create a CPSU Central Committee Bureau for Russia, whose main task would be to maintain permanent contacts with party obkoms and kraykoms. In his opinion, it is also necessary to more accurately define the functional duties of party workers and step up the party's committees' analytical work.

The floor was given to V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Our conference is being held at a very responsible, one could say a crucial moment, he said. A complex and contradictory moment, which generates heated debates and ambiguous perceptions in the country.

Of course, we are now living and working in new and more democratic conditions, in conditions of tumultuous growth of the masses' political awareness and activeness. We all are pleased by this. At the same time, however, the speaker went on, each and every one of us feels a sense of concern and alarm caused by the numerous problems which have recently emerged and continue to emerge. They include economic disorder, disorganization in the market, acute social problems, the interethnic conflicts flaring up here and there, and the manifestations of extremism. We all find it difficult to demolish old stereotypes and master the new methods of work. And now we are living through a very complex process associated with the transfer of power to the soviets of people's deputies and the fundamentally new approach to the delineation of party, state, and economic functions.

Many of us are in the grips of complex and contradictory reflections, experiences, and even doubts: Are we going in the right direction, are we doing the right thing by having launched the process of cleansing and ridding

ourselves of past distortions, are we not weakening the very foundations of our socialist development? Reasoning like this can also be heard: Would it not have been better to let sleeping dogs lie, to lead a quiet life and just plod along, as it were?

Reflecting on this, one time and again arrives at the conclusion that we have no alternative to perestroyka. Moreover, we evidently could have avoided many of our present problems and difficulties had we embarked on this turnabout some 10-15 years earlier. The opposite is also true: The country would have been thrown into the harshest of trials with consequences that would have been difficult to predict if we had delayed perestroyka by a further 5-10 years.

A difficult path lies ahead of us. In the conditions of still-growing difficulties, we must seek ways to solve complex problems and must solve each one of them separately and all of them together. We have embarked on this path and can confidently say that, on the basis of perestroyka, on the basis of democratization and new approaches, we will succeed in solving the complex problems we have inherited from the past. Of course, the main condition for this is the retention and strengthening of the party as the vanguard force of our society, of the party's renewal.

Thorough attention, different appraisals, and debates are focusing on the ideological situation and especially the mass media's activity. That happened at all the recent Central Committee plenums, it happened at the Congress of People's Deputies, and the problems of the ideological situation and ideological work occupy a central position at our conference today.

Critical evaluations of the state of affairs in this sphere are justified, there is solid ground for them. The ideological situation, just like the situation in the economy, the social sphere, and interethnic relations, is very, very complex. It reflects all our ills in other spheres, since they are refracted through social awareness. But the ideological sphere, of course, adds its own specific problems to this. It is by no means easy to work all this out. The main point is this: It may not be easy, but it is actually more important than anything else to find correct orientations in work.

Here at times we come up against diametrically opposed and extreme evaluations and proposals. One the one hand, the press, television, and radio are reproached and accused of supporting unhealthy and destabilizing trends, and demands are made to apply harsh disciplinary measures. On the other hand, there is no end to accusations against party and state organs of curbing the freedom of the press and demands to relinquish all party influence over the mass media and transform them into some sort of absolute and autonomous social force.

These are extremes, but we have to encounter them literally every day, if not every hour. There is the strongest pressure from both sides.

I think that neither of the assessments or proposals is acceptable. Clearly, the path is more complex and ambiguous, stemming from the nature of the ideological situation itself.

It has been said here that there is no firm line in ideological work, the speaker went on to point out. Quite what we are to understand by firmness, and in what sense, is a special question. But the line has been worked out in ideological work, it has been quite clearly and repeatedly set forth at our top party forums, at the January meeting with press and cultural workers, and in the report we have heard today.

We advocate the unconditional continuation of the deepening of the course of democratization, glasnost, and openness in ideological work. Nobody should have any doubts about this. Restructuring itself started with breakthroughs in the spiritual and ideological spheres and with changes in social awareness. The mass media have become a front-ranking detachment of renewal. They have provided one of the main services in clearing away the obstacles of the past and in developing democratization and glasnost. Public thinking has been freed from dogmatic fetters and unjustified bans. The real and unadorned picture of our present-day life and the history that preceded it has been laid out before people's eyes.

All this is an invaluable asset of restructuring and—this is the main thing—a working asset that is an active lever in deepening our transformations of the various aspects of social life. It would be entirely incomprehensible if we embarked on the path of ending and restricting glasnost, particularly now that restructuring is entering the most crucial stage. This is simply unacceptable to society and impossible, since the democratization process has become irreversible. Opposing it means losing people's confidence.

On the contrary, it is necessary to do everything to reinforce the atmosphere of glasnost and democratization in the ideological sphere and to create the conditions for effective activity by the mass media. In this respect new steps have been taken over the past year.

Last fall the political decision was made—once and for all I hope, the speaker noted—to abolish the quotas on subscriptions to periodicals and essentially to open the floodgates of glasnost. Works by prominent party figures which had long been inaccessible to our readers are being transferred to general-use stacks at libraries and specialized collections. The decision to repeal the 1946 CPSU Central Committee resolution on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD is of fundamental moral, political, and ideological importance. Creative unions have voiced proposals to review other resolutions on ideological issues from that period. Our attitude to these resolutions was reaffirmed yet again in an article in the journal KOMMUNIST, which was reprinted by other publications as well.

The zone of glasnost is being expanded with the help of new press organs: the journal IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS, the weekly PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK, and a number of other central publications.

We consider the line of giving people fuller information on current political events to be correct as well. The publication of the reports and debate speeches at party Central Committee plenums and the decision to provide full TV coverage of all sittings of the Congress of People's Deputies have been of particular importance abroad, one should say.

I would like to state that the version being put about that this decision was allegedly the result of some kind of pressure or prompting bears no relation to reality at all. There was nothing of the kind! This has been the opinion and position of the party Central Committee from the very outset.

The speaker went on to discuss problems arising in the ideological sphere. These are well known. Unfortunately, not all have stood the test of glasnost and democratization. It is a disease rather like the bends, which has led to excesses, distortions, and sickness. Critical ardor has sometimes been turned in on the party itself, and voices have even been raised casting doubt on and even denying socialist values and the legacy of October and Lenin. The paradox is that glasnost and a plurality of opinions are turning into their direct opposite—they are turning into the monopolies of individual groups, when the same positions are imposed, and alternative views are shamelessly dismissed.

These questions concern us all. We can all see this clearly and we all know it. We advocate ruling out subjectivism and group predilections and ensuring that our press reflects restructuring processes more fully and organically, thus actively and constructively participating in resolving the tasks facing society.

The question of relations with the press is of fundamental importance, too. This was stated in M.S. Gorbachev's report. Understandably, the party can in no way abandon its political influence on press activity. This is a most powerful weapon, and whoever controls it determines the climate and holds the key positions in shaping public opinion. It should be bluntly stated that party influence over the press has weakened. The youth press, which I have repeatedly and quite candidly discussed with Comrade Mironenko recently, requires particular attention.

To a certain extent this is a result of the essentially unique situation that has emerged in the country, when the former administration-by-edict methods of leadership of the press have diminished but new forms of political influence over the press have not been created.

The speaker noted that it is above all a question of legislative norms which should play a regulating role in this area. Naturally, any law should reflect the basic constitutional demands on the press. The elaboration of such a law will, of course, be a difficult business. It is no surprise that the law on the press has been proceeding with such great difficulty. But we absolutely need such a law if we want to create a firm foundation for mass media activity. But, of course, even the adoption of a law will not solve all problems. We need to do painstaking work with the mass media, relying on the party and civic responsibility of their leaders and all journalists.

Severe pressure, the issuing of orders to the press, and the censoring of articles are unacceptable. I think that this has become particularly obvious since the Congress of People's Deputies. We need to establish relations of trust with press workers, and not just with leaders but with the main mass of journalist cadres, on whom a very great deal depends, and who determine the climate in editorial offices.

Journalists comprise a huge and independent creative force which we should not order around; we should work alongside them, skillfully persuading and directing them toward solutions to topical problems.

Supporting everything that is healthy, valuable, and critical, and everything that serves the cause of restructuring, we must ensure party influence not with exhortations, bans, and excommunication [otlucheniye] but by providing as much information as possible, arguing persuasively, and consistently seeking the truth. Of course, all this does not rule out an increase of demands on journalist cadres and mass media leaders; on the contrary, it presupposes it. In leading the central press we strive to combine both aspects.

Lately certain efforts have been made to make our press constructive and devote attention to topical issues of restructuring - not least, and perhaps first and foremost, topical problems of the restructuring of the party itself.

When necessary, organizational measures are being taken too. The leadership of State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting has been replaced. And we hope that the situation in television will change for the better. It is also time for certain structural improvements to the central press. Analysis has shown that there are gaps in the press organs system.

In conclusion, V.A. Medvedev said that the role and responsibility of the ideological sphere in the process of restructuring and renewing the party is growing. It is now impossible to solve a single problem without taking public opinion into account, and the shaping of public opinion depends to an enormous extent on the mass media. This compels all of us to link ideological work and the mass media more closely and fully with the fundamental problems of our restructuring.

The floor was given to K. Salykov, first secretary of Kara-Kalpak Uzbek Communist Party Obkom. The complex situation that has been created, he noted, is like

a mirror image of the standard of political leadership in the country. The concern in the CPSU Central Committee is legitimate, the entire party and people are now concerned. We should not dramatize or idealize events but make real assessments of them.

There have been certain improvements during the years of restructuring, and criticism is sometimes the result of our self-reproach.

Today's meeting is valuable but somewhat belated. Henceforth such meetings should be held on a really regular and planned basis.

Our programs are good, but there is an inexplicable sluggishness in implementing them and no mechanism for monitoring the fulfillment of decisions has been elaborated, as shown by a number of resolutions on Karakalpakia's problems.

The transfer of economic functions to the soviets should be accelerated, but many questions of their work have yet to be resolved. Today the leader of an executive organ must be a talented, competent, willful organizer responsible for the organization of work on the territory.

Processes of democratization in the party are the most vital question, the speaker noted. Far be it from me either to overdramatize or to idealize. Social organizations and communists must boldly go among the people when resolving cadre questions. The multiple-candidate and rotation approaches must be transferred from an experiment into a system.

It is now necessary to eliminate political crises, solve the problems of the economic and social lag in certain regions, and pay particular attention to ecological disaster zones.

The speaker advocated holding a party conference out of necessity and proposed convening the next CPSU congress at the scheduled time. We cannot allow confusion, we must carry out good-quality preparations so that the deficiencies that emerged at the Congress of People's Deputies are not repeated at the party congress. Now it is necessary to get down to drawing up a plan for preparations for the congress and to form commissions on the party program and statutes.

Our country and our party are indeed going through a very crucial and complex time, V.I. Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted. We are all keenly aware of this situation and are seeking ways, means, and methods to solve the huge problems now facing our people.

It is clear that the restructuring that began in April 1985 and the renewal of Soviet society are an absolutely correct and irreversible process, and there can be no deviation from it. We must move only forward and seek ways out of the prevailing situation along the road of restructuring, that is, the road of renewal. The point is that restructuring is indeed not going as one would like or, to be more frank, there is mounting criticism among the people—among communists and nonparty people. This is becoming highly acute in a number of regions.

All the shortcomings that have emerged recently are linked to the activity of the party and party organizations. So naturally today's conference must to some extent reveal these problems and determine ways to solve them.

Of course, complex processes are taking place. The areas in which restructuring work is taking place are multifaceted. They embrace economic, social, political, ideological, and other problems. Their solution depends not only on the activity of local organs on party organizations, soviets, enterprises, and economic leaders, but also, of course, on the activity of the relevant central organs.

First, the economic problem is presently the most acute one. The difficulties we are now experiencing because of the unavailability for sale of a whole series of goods and products, the introduction of various forms of rationing and coupons, and so forth are creating an edgy atmosphere and are seriously worrying the people.

Clearly, despite everything, the process of economic transformations and economic reform have not produced the expected end results. Although—let us be blunt—thorough preparatory work for the reform seems to have been done. Economic experiments were conducted on a broad front, but clearly, not everything was fully thought out in the formulation of the reform, and there were distortions in its implementation at the local level. In fact, we expected that there might be mistakes and deficiencies. The most important thing is to spot them in time and rectify them. The time has come to change a whole series of provisions; yet we are waiting for something and hoping for the changes to take place spontaneously.

The law on the enterprise has been mentioned here. When we adopted it, we thought it was a very good law. Labor collective councils, elections of leaders, the contract system of relations—all this is wonderful. State orders were to be minimized as a brake. Mutually advantageous contractual commitments were to create good economic conditions, and things would go splendidly. In reality a great deal turned out to be by no means simple and turned out very differently from the way we had expected. Many enterprises found loopholes for making better use of profits, but only in their own narrowly conceived interests. They began to arbitrarily reallocate funds with the aim of ensuring that much of them went on extra pay right now. And the increase in wages was often double the increase in output. But what about the future, how is the enterprise going to develop, how is it to be retooled to create the conditions for future

work? This is not always taken into account. And I think the blame for this lies with enterprise leaders, not with labor collective councils, as some people try to make out.

Questions about the election of leaders are being raised quite correctly. The question is not whether to organize elections or not. The most important thing is to ensure that the person we elect is worthy and competent and, second, that after his election he assumes full responsibility and exercises sole command, as stated in the law. But in practice this is not always done. Many leaders try to humor the collective and to be all things to all men. They fight for an understated plan, do not conclude a contract, and hike the prices of output regardless of the fact that this may harm other enterprises and is not in the state's interests.

This question must be pondered. It is not a matter of rescinding the right to choose the leader. It is a matter of how to resolve this question objectively. The minister also needs to have a right —the right to approve or reject the director. After all, many people have been present at the session and have seen how ministers are grilled. But at present they essentially cannot influence a ineffectual enterprise leader when he takes refuge in the claim that the labor collective council refuses to accept the order and will have nothing to do with him as director. We must think how to correct the Law on the State Enterprise in this regard.

Consider contractual relations and the state order. Everyone, the press included, cursed the state order, saying that it crushed and stifled, that it is a completely useless system, and that only contractual relations would open the gates for us. But what has actually happened? Requests are now once again coming in from everywhere, saying: If we have a state order, then everything will be fine—there'll be supplies, resources, responsibility, and output. Why? Because loads of enterprises in our country are still not concluding contracts. They bargain: You give us some metal, we will give you some meat, you give us some meat, we will give you some timber, and so forth.

The law on the enterprise is now conflicting with the draft Law on Local Self-Management and the Local Economy, which is now being examined in the Supreme Soviet. They must be interlinked so that local soviets do indeed have rights and can jointly coordinate work. It is worth giving some thought to this problem, too.

Or take the questions of material supply. The situation here too is deteriorating rather than improving. We pinned hopes on wholesale trade and thought that it would give us the broadest opportunities. But there are no changes for the better. How can there be wholesale trade when virtually everything is in short supply in our country! What takes place is not trade, but elementary allocation of resources. And there are many such questions.

That is why, when we speak of economic accountability and the economic mechanism, we must feel this mechanism and ensure that it really works. This is not yet the case.

As for territorial economic accountability, Of course this is a good, tempting idea. For instance, we in Russia are also in favor of economic accountability, but economic accountability of a kind which would be built on the basis of equal conditions. For this it is necessary, first, to introduce order to wholesale and wholesale factory prices in the country. Subsequently we will obviously also have to think about retail prices. We will not resolve the problem of contract relations and we will not reach the world market unless we do something about prices. Only in that event is it possible to build equal economically accountable relations between the republics. If the Russian Federation, as the republic which has the basic raw material resources, builds its relations on present prices for that raw material, then that economic accountability is not suitable for us. Because the majority of the raw material sectors are subsidized by the state. Here we must carefully investigate how quickly we should embark on territorial economic accountability. I understand the opinion of the comrades from the Baltic republics that this will make it possible to remove political tension and resolve their economic and social questions which the people are raising. But we must also think about what will happen after that. How will this economic accountability look when we revise prices for oil, gas, coal, metal, yarn, textiles, and so forth? In what conditions will these republics be placed? Yet it is evidently impossible to build normal economic accountability between all republics without putting prices in order, without going out onto the international market, which we have also been discussing.

And a last question—the work of the banks. I fully support the opinion that with the reform of the banks we committed an error by creating a system of sectorial banks and reducing the importance of the State Bank [Gosbank]. The result was that we strengthened the center and weakened the organs locally, at the lower level. We must now restructure the banking system in such a way that Gosbank is the main element in the state banking system. Commercial banks can be created, as many as you like. After all, in their present form banks in our country are responsible for nothing. The result is that they give generous credits to cooperative members, give them money or transfer noncash assets from enterprises, the cooperatives turn them into cash, establish various ties, once again, in the majority of cases, with enterprises, and have enormous incomes on the basis of this brokerage. Yet the state and the population receive nothing from these deals. But individual housing construction has been launched in the country and banks cannot give credits to a working man or peasant to construct a house using money he has borrowed so as to help the state in housing construction. What kind of a bank is it if it cannot help us create the necessary social conditions in the countryside and the city?

About political reform. I fully agree that we have not prepared very seriously for the elections, committed a whole series of blunders, put our trust in old methods and old approaches, and believed that everything would happen of its own accord. The elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet and the local soviets are now being prepared. This is indeed an extraordinarily complex task. We must immediately begin preparation for these elections, create public opinion, form cadres who could engage in the election campaign, and resolve a whole series of questions on which it is worth holding a special conference. We cannot allow the republics to go in different directions in the system and organization of elections. Perhaps, taking into account the specific features of the republics, there will be some diversity, some individual features, but the basic principles of the elections must be worked out. A big part here belongs to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The question of the situation which has taken shape in connection with the division of the functions of the party and the soviets was quite rightly raised. Why has there been a change in structure in our country while the local soviets have received no power? I think that if the draft law on local self-management and the local economy is adopted, opportunities will appear to eliminate the snags which have arisen.

Literally two words about the press. It has indeed done much that it is useful, and it is not a case of viewing all its activity negatively. Journalists are doing much that is interesting and useful. But nonetheless we must seriously investigate critical remarks, and I would apply that in particular to television. The question is now how many conferences and seminars we hold with journalists or how the leadership of the mass media is organized in our country but who works there. That is the question. A newspaper can be the organ of the Central Committee and led by a communist but the main thing is what he is like, what position he has, how far he complies with the perestroyka process, how far he helps the party constructively implement this perestroyka process. People on whom we can rely should work in the press.

One last comment. We believe that, particularly in light of public opinion, it is necessary to boost the Russian Federation's sovereign rights. We must improve the party political structure and create economic and administrative organs of management which correspondent to those existing in other republics. We must emphasize national, social, geographical, and other issues specific to the RSFSR. We must also have a scientific center. In particular, we must have a Russian Academy of Sciences which would unite specific academic institutes. It is essential to resolve questions of ideology and education. After all, we have no relevant organ presently. Our autonomous formations and oblasts should have the opportunity to have access to television and have additional publishing houses, press organs, and so forth. Right now, I do not want to give the background to these problems, but they do exist. I think we must discuss them more thoroughly.

We cannot fail to ask ourselves why much of what was defined sufficiently correctly in the perestroyka programs is being implemented with such difficulty and sometimes simply unsatisfactorily, N.I. Malkov, first secretary of the Chita CPSU Obkom, noted. The situation is complicated no longer in just individual regions but in the country as a whole. I do not know about anyone else, but I was quite shocked by what has happened in the Kuzbass. I believe that if even Siberia has not held out, if even here people have started to sway, then this is almost the limit. Not only in the Kuzbass, but also throughout East Siberia and the Far East, the situation is in no way different from the one that has taken shape in the Kuzbass. In the speaker's opinion, the present approach toward assessing extraordinary situations is incorrect: The big bosses, so to speak, arrived, saw everything at once, and decided everything. Conclusions are immediately drawn and assessments are given to the effect that the local organs are failing to do something; they are failing to work something out. We must not delude ourselves, the speaker said. The situation is far more complex and serious; it demands tested decisions and actions.

The Chita party obkom first secretary pointed out that the situation in East Siberia and the Far East is not changing so far. This is the region which is the country's most important raw material base. All natural resources, almost all unique, are mainly extracted from here. It is perhaps not a question of the fact that no comprehensive raw material processing has been organized here. It is cheaper and more efficient but you obviously cannot do everything at once. In terms of ensuring the comprehensive nature of its development and in terms of its provision with social amenities, Siberia, according to the speaker, remains at a level lower than the average level in the republic, not to mention individual republics and the country as a whole. The long-term state program for the comprehensive development of the production forces of the Transbaykal and the Far East adopted in 1987 has started to crack from the moment it was adopted. Today it is stated that it was adopted without foundation and is not backed up by capital investments. Yet this program was elaborated and discussed with the participation of the labor collectives and it instilled hope and confidence in a change in the socioeconomic situation in the region. It became the program with which we went to the elections of USSR people's deputies. We are thinking of taking it to the elections of republican and local soviets of people's deputies.

The speaker continued that today we must say more or less the same about the situation which has taken shape in our country since the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum. That is also with regard to how we make decisions and how we then implement them.

The speaker then dwelled on the results of the elections of USSR people's deputies. He supported the critical comments about how, to this day, no profound analysis has been made and no conclusions have been drawn

from their results. He noted the need to increase responsibility to improve the selection, placement, and education of cadres. He expressed the wish that the provisions and conclusions of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's report and the theses set forth in N.I. Ryzhkov's report will be placed at the basis of the elaboration of specific measures connected with stepping up the influence of the party and party organizations on society's development.

K.M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, mentioned the importance of renewing the cadre composition of the party apparatus at all levels in the party organization's activity to develop internal party democracy. He talked in detail about the measures being taken which make it possible to strengthen party committees with able workers. But the significant renewal of the cadre corps which has taken place, from his viewpoint, also has its negative aspects. One of them is cadres' poor training, which is substantially complicating the solution of the difficult tasks confronting the republic party organization. The Central Committee Bureau believes, he continued, that in the complex political situation which is taking shape in the republic, the ability of primary party organizations to influence the progress of events and the active position of each communist are very important.

In the conditions of socialist democracy which has developed, the party must ensure the formation of the ideology of renewal, the speaker continued. Now, as the practice of the party committees' work shows, not a single worthwhile decision in the sphere of economics, social development, ecology, or interethnic relations can be made without thoroughly taking into account public opinion and the possible political consequences. Hence, every decision needs not only a profound scientific basis but also the preparation of public opinion.

Ideological work, the first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee stressed, is one of the main elements in administering social processes. Two-way communications, including feedback reflecting the opinion, will, and collective reason of various categories of the population, also take on decisive significance. Many of our ideological cadres were unprepared for work among the masses in the new conditions. One of the main reasons for the slowness to restructure ideological-education work is the survival of formal approaches in it. This position is rooted in the distortions permitted in the recent past in the formation of party committees' ideological corps, mainly from among women. They now make up almost two-thirds of party obkom, gorkom, and raykom secretaries for ideology.

Particular attention needs to be paid to the theoretical training of party cadres, most of whom are still not noted for their desire to thoroughly master the Leninist legacy and cannot analyze profoundly the ambiguous and sometimes contradictory processes of modern life and, consequently, influence them.

Dwelling on questions connected with improving interethnic relations, the speaker noted that perestroyka spotlighted here a great deal which had sometimes been hidden away and was kept down by a reluctance to face the truth. An important aspect of work in this sphere are questions connected with the switch of union republics to economic accountability and self-financing. Specific work is being carried out in the republic in this direction. But today in defining our future tasks in this sphere, the speaker stressed, we are running into certain difficulties, without getting real assistance from the appropriate CPSU Central Committee departments and central organs.

V.B. Temirbayev, first secretary of the Chimkent Kazakh Communist Party Obkom, took the floor.

In assessing the state of affairs, he said, the central organs sometimes lay responsibility for the negative processes at the door of the lower management echelons. But the center's prestige cannot be real and firm without its local organs' winning prestige. The country's leadership must recognize its own mistakes and errors in a timely and open manner or talk about the changed circumstances, otherwise people accuse the local organs of ignoring government decisions, of bureaucratizing, and so on.

The CPSU Central Committee must be the generator not only of ideas but also of ways to implement them, particularly on questions of party-organizational, cadre, and ideological work. Tried and tested mechanisms are needed to implement principled political directives.

The speaker put forward specific proposals on the introduction of changes to the CPSU Statutes and to the practice of party work directed at improving the style and methods of party organs' organizational and ideological activity. He further advocated improving party committees' technical provision.

Party work must really be put on a scientific basis. There is a need to formulate a concept of socialism in modern historical conditions in order to remove the question about the nature of the society we are building, to draw up a scientifically based program of practical measures designed to increase people's interest in sociopolitical life, and to form in them high moral and ethical values. It is necessary to restructure work with the mass media and really ensure that newspapers are the organ of the party committee. The press is not carrying many editorial articles against which people at the local level can check their practical actions.

In conclusion, the speaker analyzed the problems of cadre work and stressed the need to increase the party worker's prestige and his social protection.

Ya.Ya. Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, analyzed the political situation in the republic, calling it ambiguous and even contradictory. Tension, he noted, is not abating. There

are many reasons, but today the population's dissatisfaction with the economic situation, primarily with supplies, is being highlighted. Hence, the criticism of the party and the Soviet authorities is, for the most part, fair and well deserved, although much of it is excessive.

The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is carrying out the appropriate explanatory work. But it is not words but specific deeds which are needed. We must actually prove that the union republic can be a sovereign state within the USSR, and republic economic accountability must be the first step in this direction. Other measures, particularly expanding the rights of the union republics in international affairs, are also meant to help increase sovereignty. The status and independence of the union republics' communist parties should be increased.

It is unfortunate, but it has to be admitted, that the process of democratization in the party is lagging behind the process of democratization in society as a whole, the speaker continued. I believe that the party must be built on principles of democratic centralism, but the constituent parts of that concept must be equal. After all, the centralism persisted in our country since the personality cult era and during the stagnation period, whereas there has been little or virtually no democracy.

I think that relations between the center and the periphery in the democratization process must be built on more trust and mutual understanding.

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a concluding speech at the conference.

Gorbachev's Concluding Speech at 18 Jul Session

PM2107090989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

["Concluding speech" by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 18 July CPSU Central Committee meeting in Moscow]

[Text] Comrades! I think I express the common view when I voice satisfaction with the discussion that has been held at this Central Committee conference on the most important issue—the CPSU's activities at the present very important and crucial stage of the restructuring.

In this connection, there is something I would like to mention at the very outset: I do not entirely understand the pronouncements of some comrades to the effect that we have not had enough of these exchanges of views. I would like to remind you that we now hold Central Committee plenums every 2 months, and sometimes even every month. During these plenums there are discussions of virtually every aspect of the great revolutionary undertaking we call restructuring.

Beginning with the April Central Committee plenum, each of the subsequent plenums has, in effect, been a new step along the path of progress toward a deeper understanding of our society. On the basis of this analysis and of our new knowledge, new approaches have been formulated and new steps have been forecast in all spheres of society's life. I would rate each plenum very highly; none of them came easily, and behind each of them there was a great deal of collective labor.

Let us think back to the January and June plenums of 1987, at which the concept of political and economic reform was drawn up. We still have not put into effect everything that was laid down there. At the February 1988 plenum extensive consideration was given to matters pertaining to the ideological back-up for restructuring and to the basic guidelines for this work. The plenum of March of this year was a major stage in the party's agarian policy. Other plenums are approaching.

It is possible that the extensive and collective discussion of issues of intraparty activity and party life was insufficient. We strove to act in such a way that within the framework of the plenums—precisely the plenums—the main issues were worked out and consolidated in their fundamental decisions, so that these decisions would become a fulcrum and point of reference in the activity of the party organizations.

At the present revolutionary stage of perestroyka, both the Politburo and the secretaries of the Central Committee must pay more attention to the issues of party life and activity. For it is especially necessary for the party today that all the complexities which our party organizations are experiencing, and the problems which arise in party life, should be detected more rapidly and analyzed by the Party Central Committee, its Politburo, and its apparatus so that through feedback party organizations and party committees can receive definite recommendations and advice.

Indeed, the most important thing consists no doubt in the fact—and comrades speeches have also drawn attention to this—that in the final analysis perestroyka could not have begun and its policy and strategy could not have taken shape without the principled position taken by the CPSU. And today perestroyka cannot advance successfully if our party—the generator of the ideas of perestroyka, its organizing, rallying, and persuading force—fails to act vigorously. From this point of view, all that was contained in the speeches of our comrades today—and incidentally that which was discussed at the April Central Committee plenum as well—we must think all this over well and draw far-reaching conclusions. That was the first thing that I wanted to mention.

There is an extreme need for the acute and frank exchange of views that has been held about the party, about the way it must act today when the revolutionary restructuring has become a reality. Once again we are becoming convinced that at this most complex turning point there are not and will not be any simple and easy solutions, comrades.

This is the conclusion stemming from the discussion of the party activity in the present complex specific conditions, when a strained situation has taken shape in the socioeconomic sphere and in the mood of society.

I wish to stress once more: There are not any simple solutions and none are foreseen. There is no and there will be no return to the "good old days" although some people still have traces of nostalgia for them. It is necessary to seek answers to the questions of life by progressively forming one's line and acting in the spirit of that line, perfecting the approaches and methods of party work and realizing the enormous potential inherent in our party, the political vanguard of society. But if anyone is entertaining the notion that it is still possible to get on top of this exacerbated situation and these exacerbated processes by relying on the old methods and approaches, by acting in the old way, then that person is making the greatest and deepest error. And this must be said quite clearly and definitely.

It may be that this is not to everyone's liking. But I would not be doing my duty if I did not say it bluntly and openly, both in my report, and now in conclusion.

In a society that is renewing itself, the party must constantly renew itself. And, as we remarked earlier, everything must begin with the party. Moreover, the processes of renewal of the party and the perfecting of its methods of work must always run ahead, so that, as it renews itself, the party may ensure the creation of a modern progressive policy of perestroyka and its implementation through the appropriate level of organizational and ideological work, through a very effective and intensive cadres policy adequate to our time. Only then will the party fulfil the role of political vanguard of society.

No one can replace the self-renewing party. For it has the vitally important functions that determine the fate of perestroyka; and it can only realize them by acting as a revolutionary force.

We must see and understand all this, comrades, if we are not to be mistaken in the analysis of our work. And above all, we must do everything in order to ensure that the party constantly grows stronger and that its energy, influence, and revolutionary strength increase.

I am also speaking about this because in a part of society doubts have arisen: Has the party not at the stage of abrupt changes gone back on what it proclaimed, to which it called the whole of society and carried society behind itself, gone back on revolutionary perestroyka? The fact is that it is not so; we must prove every day by specific deeds, moves for the better—let them be small ones even—by the active positions of the party committees, communists and primary party organizations. It is precisely this of which we do not yet have enough.

It is impossible to decree the party's authority. This cannot now be done by the most powerful decree or decision. We won our authority at the first stage of perestroyka when we proposed the policies of perestroyka to society. And society believed in the party, supported it, and was behind it. Today authority can be won only by the decisive and consistent implementation of the policies of perestroyka. There is not and there will not be another route for the party to win authority! If anyone is counting on something else, this is not realistic, comrades.

For this reason life must be faced, not hidden from. However complicated it may be, however many nonstandard, acute situations are encountered which generally turn our concept of social processes upside down, we must enter into these processes.

If perestroyka is a revolution—and we have agreed on this—if it means deep changes in ownership relations, the situation of people, the foundations of the political system, and in the spiritual sphere; and if it transforms the people into a real force for transitions in society, can it all really go quietly and smoothly?

And is it really necessary to panic when the revolutionary processes have become a reality? We have evoked them by our policy. Didn't we understand this when we discussed all this? But we have definitely raised the task of restructuring. Therefore, society has gone out on that road. And in such conditions the party must act vigorously and as the political vanguard, improving its work among the masses. There cannot be a situation whereby society is in turmoil around us, and some comrades sit in their offices and think: What is this which is happening and was it necessary for us to start it? How can one reason like that? After all, society has perceived the ideas and essence of perestroyka not as applied to certain alien, borrowed values, but within the framework of socialism, within the framework of socialist democracy which reveals the potential of this system in the interests of the people. This all accords with Lenin—socialism is growing up via democracy and is being realized as a system of the working people only through democracy!

The restructuring processes that are under way today are embracing all spheres of our lives. They contain much that is unusual, which at times is very difficult to fathom. This creates extra tension. But this is what makes them revolutionary years! We all must understand this and act as a revolutionary party, because otherwise such forces will be found which, seeing that the party is lagging behind, will attempt to take the initiative. And such attempts exist. How can it happen that a party organization with many thousands of communists which possesses its own newspapers, its own professional cadres, which possesses everything, suddenly begins to lose the initiative.

There is only one reason for this: it means that we are lagging behind, it means that among us somewhere a gap is appearing between words and deeds, between the mass and the party which ought, as a vanguard, to move ahead and see farther and more than the rest. But we are

neglecting this, and other forces are often taking advantage of this. All this is happening. Only one solution can be seen here too: the interests of people and their problems must always be discussed and resolved specifically and promptly. In conducting a policy in the interests of the people, we must always be together with the people.

It would be irresponsible in the current difficult situation not to be worried about the destiny of the party, because it is also the destiny of perestroyka, the destiny of the country and of socialism. But it would be no less irresponsible to engage in pessimism. It is precisely during the revolutionary perestroyka that a new party is being born, that the style and methods of party activity are being renewed, and that fresh new forces are pouring into the party which are ready to take upon themselves the entire revolutionary process and to advance it. All this is naturally taking place with pain, with difficulty. In principle, that is how it should be. A revolutionary time is no situation of comfort.

I would like to dwell on some specific things. The issue of our need to thoroughly support primary party organizations was raised here correctly, both from a viewpoint of putting the emphasis of our activity on precisely this direction, and because the primary organizations are the lever by which it is possible to greatly advance all of party life and to invigorate the entire party. In other words, this is the very best means whereby society can gain a sense of change in the party, its new dynamics, new style, new forms, and its closeness to people.

Broad opportunities for this are opening up in connection with the forthcoming report-back and election campaign. We have to ensure that the matters that are being discussed in the factory shops, at rallies and in homes are the focus of party discussions. The party must not be kept in a condition whereby around it everything is buzzing with activity while many party organizations spend their time yawning.

Surely that is not what party life should be. Who does it suit, comrades? It means that a thorough and exacting discussion must take place during the report-back and election campaigns about the work of the party organizations and that they must be headed by people who today enjoy real authority among communists. We must, of course, maintain cadres, and we shall do that. Yet the main condition for strengthening the party's prestige is that the party itself should act dynamically, that it should be closer to people and should deal with pressing problems together with them. If that does not occur, a dangerous discrepancy forms.

Here I am coming to the thing that exerts a very strong influence on the exacerbation of the political situation within the country. I refer to the many unresolved questions of everyday life. I felt this—I repeat once again—particularly acutely in Leningrad, when we went into the consumer goods production shop and saw the conditions under which people were working there. The work-benches were primitively equipped, there was heavy manual labor, dust, and a lack of ventilation. And that at a theoretically front-ranking enterprise! What sort of a restructuring is it if we are choking from dust, the workers said to me? The worst thing is that they are intending to improve the situation in the shop and tackle its problems in 2 years' time. Where is the party organization taking a stand here? Where is it using its authority to intervene?

You cannot work like that! The many-thousand strong collective of the association intends to commission one house a year using the own-resources method.

And in the Ukraine, at the mining equipment works that I visited, 5,000 workers build two or three houses ever year. And the people openly say: Now we have a good manager, one who puts himself out. And although much still remains for him to do, the mood of the people there has changed.

No, comrades, the way to defend the party organizations and our cadres is to see to it that they become involved actively in all the restructuring processes, and that they assess from political positions the changes that are taking place, above all in the sphere of the economy and in the social field. These issues have been raised in a party spirit, yet we not infrequently take under our wing those who are sticking to the old ways. And do you know why? Because for many years we have been accustomed to taking everything on ourselves and we are still doing it, whereas we ought to be demanding more of each person in regard to his allotted task. Whoever is in the soviets must be responsible for his area, and whoever is at the enterprise, for his. Most of them, after all, are party members. Let them act accordingly.

And at the same time, how many questions of theory, policy, and party activity have been neglected! And this, too, is causing us considerable losses. All this must be set right.

Comrades, it is very important for us now to strengthen our authority by our deeds, to win at least some small victory every day, every week, and every month. It is necessary for us that tomorrow some shortage should be "made up," an acute ecological issue resolved, and the functioning of transportation organized properly. This is how issues should be raised and tackled. And if party organizations and party committees facilitate this, we shall have no cause to talk of a crisis of confidence.

I agree with many of the other remarks made by the comrades here on this score, although I do not agree with all that has been said. But that is what an exchange of views is all about. I think that as it progressed, we felt the full responsibility of the moment and the importance of the problem we were discussing—how the party should act in concrete circumstances when restructuring is under way in every sphere and when the functions of

party and economic bodies are being separated. From this point of view, the exchange has been a useful one.

If one were to sum up the entire course of the debate on the problems that are now confronting the party and on the complexities and difficulties that have arisen in the restructuring process and in the work of the party itself, one could say quite unequivocally that it all comes down to cadres. Let us, therefore, from principled party standpoints determine what we ought to do about this. First and foremost this is a question of the cadres, attitude toward the job entrusted to them, toward fulfilment of their duties, toward a sincere style, and to what extent this or that party worker is close to the people, is capable of leading others and shouldering new duties at a stage of revolutionary change. This is the party's principal task, and this task must be tackled. If we do this, we will be able to resolve all the other issues.

A renewal of cadres is needed, an influx of fresh forces. And this renewal must take place at the level of the labor collective, the rayon, the city, oblast, kray, republic, Central Committee, and Politburo. It concerns everyone. Everywhere, at every level, the pressing cadre issues must be resolved in good time.

That is the approach that must be taken. For there is nothing higher than the interests of revolutionary perestroyka which determines the fate of the people and how we will live today, tomorrow, and in the future, I repeat there is nothing higher than these interests. And everything should be subordinated to this.

It is precisely from such positions that all of cadre policy should be strongly conducted. Today this is the key to changing things for the better. Cadre work must be conducted in the spirit of the party, democratically, showing concern for people. But all issues that have come to a head must be resolved urgently. I emphasize once again that this concerns all sections of the party and the state. And if we are to put the question in this way, then I will say bluntly: In relation to this, too, the people will support us and will be with us. The cadres must start work in a different way—more vigorously and energetically, and with more initiative. And where a replacement is necessary, new people must go there and actively enter into the work.

In general I welcome this open party discussion that has taken place today at the conference in the party's Central Committee. It was necessary for us—on this we agree. I would like to hope that we will all draw the necessary conclusions from this party discussion.

Several speakers have insistently asked and even demanded a ready-made concept on each issue from the party Central Committee and from the Politburo. Give the party's concept on perestroyka, give the concept of petrestroyka for organizational work, give the concept on other issues. I think that there is an echo from the past, an echo of the many years of parasitism in these requests. We have a general policy of perestroyka and approaches to it have been worked out. But I think there are not and will not be ready-made blueprints and recipes for each individual and for every situation. Only by moving along the path of perestroyka will we accumulate collective experience, crystallize new approaches, and introduce into the projected line the necessary corrections, adding to it and developing it. None of us has ready answers to the questions posed by life. It has always been so and will be so in the revolutionary period.

The main thing has been defined: socialism, the people's interests, democracy, glasnost, and the party as a generator of ideas and an organizing force. For the rest, we must think independently and act independently, reflect, and detect in good time what life demands. Moreover, in each actual situation and in each region it takes on its own aspect and demands unorthodox approaches and decisions.

Of course, one must learn to work in the conditions of perestroyka. And textbooks are necessary, and seminars, and courses. And I have spoken about this more than once. But, comrades, that in no way justifies the passive, temporizing position and the dependence on the party of certain party committees and party organizations! There are also such moods among the first secretaries, members of the Central Committee. We are creating experience by the enormous joint work of the party and the people. And the presence of this experience depends on our joint efforts to renew society. Now one issue for consultation with you. It concerns our society a great deal. I mean, how to help poorly provided for strata of the population more rapidly. Moreover, we should resolve this issue before the finish of work of this session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Fundamental decisions on this issue have been taken by the Congress of People's Deputies. Now the government is looking for sources of funds. It is not easy to find them. Therefore, perhaps, we will do this: Contribute for these purposes R500 million from party dues, which comes to about 30 percent of their annual amount. Then let's do this: It will be a good move. Do you support it?

Voices: We support it.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. I think there will be other followers of this initiative. All the best, comrades, I wish you success in your affairs!

Report on 20 Jul Supreme Soviet Meeting

LD2007172289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 20 July broadcasts a 16-minute report presented by Marina Novitskaya on the Supreme Soviet proceedings. Novitskaya reviews the week's proceedings and observes that the attention today has moved to the committees and commissions.

She begins with the Committee on Agrarian Issues and Food, which is working on practical implementation of the appeal by agrarian deputies made at the congress. Aleksandr Iosifovich Dubko, chairman of a Grodno Oblast agroindustrial combine, talks with Olga Vasilenko about what she terms "a very turbulent and very difficult sitting, at which Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, and Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev were present".

Dubko stresses the importance of food supplies and enumerates some criticisms made by deputies, such as the lack of material and technical provision, the prevalence of the "left-over" principle and the poor standard of living in the country compared to the city. "All the same, Nikolay Ivanovich and Yegor Kuzmich let it be known that there is concern, that the government and the Central Committee know the true state of affairs and are participating very actively. In general, a program, a program for providing agriculture with what it needs, will be elaborated in the immediate future." "The government is elaborating it. The government is giving it to us, the agrarian committee, for our conclusions. The government knows the situation and feels its responsibility and will do everything necessary to improve greatly the state of affairs in agriculture and to introduce order in the provinces."

The next meeting featured is the Soviet of the Union's Commission on Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy. Chairman Nikolay Nikolayevich Gritsenko is heard reading the agenda at the start of the sitting for the current day's discussions, which includes a decree on taxation of cooperatives and the draft law on the procedure for settling collective labor disputes, and for tomorrow, when a meeting is planned with People's Control Committee Chairman Kolbin to discuss projected checks on the State Price Committee monitoring of industrial and cooperative goods and prices charged for agricultural equipment.

However, Novitskaya comments, the commission's proceedings were interrupted by reality in the middle of the day, when "the commission received a report of yet another strike." Aleksandr Ruvinskiy continues the report, explaining that Vladimir Petrovich Lushnikov had to leave the meeting and is about the depart for Vorkuta "at the behest of the commission." Lushnikov corrects him: "I am flying to Vorkuta, but not only at the behest of the commission—well, in particular, at the behest of the commission, but also by a common decision. We telephoned Vorkuta and talked to the Vorkuta and Inta miners, in particular. Last night I had a telephone call from the chairman of the committee set up in Inta by the coal miners, which is elaborating the package of demands which need to be solved today to stabilize the situation and to ensure normal working and living conditions for the miners, and not only for the miners, but for workers in the far north in general. In particular, I am talking about workers in the far north in connection with the fact that my constituency, Territorial Constituency No. 372, includes Usinsk, Pechora, Inta, and Vorkuta." Ruvinskiy mentions that Lushnikov is himself a miner, and then asks him about the mandates which Lushnikov has from the commission. "The point is," Lushnikov replies, "that I believe that the main cause of the situation that has arisen in the country as a whole, and not just in our region, is the lack of efficient information, the inefficient dissemination of the decisions which have already been adopted today. Today, literally, we were telling Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov that a mass of decisions have already been adopted and the issues have already been settled." "They are being settled in the industry as a whole. But when yesterday I asked Mikhail Sergeyevich for just one minute, when the whole hall had decided that enough had been said on this subject, when representatives of the Donbass and Kuzbass had spoken—in particular, they at least tried to say that it was not just their problem, but they touched on the Kuzbass and the Donbass. Mikhail Sergeyevich said 'both the Donbass and the Kuzbass', but there was nothing said there about the Pechora coal basin. And, you know, that provoked a mass of dissatisfaction—not only with what Mikhail Sergeyevich said, but with the view that the deputies had displayed their passive position at the sitting and had not expressed our problems. I want to say that that is far from true, and we have proved it and are proving it with our work."

Ruvinskiy persists with the question about mandates from the commission, receiving the answer that Lushnikov is going to Vorkuta "with the fact that a number of the proposals which are being raised and are contained in the demands being presented by the miners have already been reflected in our commission. We have already conveyed these proposals to a number of organizations and departments which are engaged in elaborating draft legislative acts, in which they will subsequently be reflected and embodied." "Now, indeed, the commission has examined these problems, those of the Kuzbass and the Donbass, and our problems which we have raised, for the northern regions—everybody's problems. In no measure are we dividing things down into parts, saying that this is this region's problem and that is the next region's. There are particular, specific problems, but we are not dealing with them today; we have to settle them at our local levels, in our own republics. But those which concern the state are being settled, believe me."

Novitskaya uses the above reference to local issues as a link to a recording of remarks by Valeriy Ivanovich Voskoboynikov of Novyy Urengoy, in an interview with an unidentified male correspondent, about impending local elections. He accuses members of the republics' Supreme Soviets of interpreting the law on elections in a way which suits the appartatus and calls for the USSR Supreme Soviet to lay down a clear line on how things should be done. In particular, he wants to do away with blocs of deputies from social organizations and with constituency assemblies. He cites "many very sad events

in various republics" as evidence that local authorities have lost control of the situation and are not popular.

In her concluding remarks, Novitskaya notes that "these concerns of deputies are well known, they have been heard, and on Saturday [22 July] there will be a conference of chairmen of the presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of Union and Autonomous republics. As you know, elections there are conducted on the basis of the republic's legislation and are regulated only by its laws—the laws of the union and autonomous republics. For this reason the representatives of the Supreme Soviets have decided to meet together in Moscow, to exchange experience and to have consultations."

Moscow TV Reports Session

LD2007183489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Video report by special correspondent P. Orlov on the USSR Supreme Soviet—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Orlov] The committees and commissions of the chambers are meeting today in the Kremlin, at the Moskva Hotel where many of the deputies are currently living and working, and also here at the Supreme Soviet building on Prospect Kalinina Avenue.

Decrees and drafts of new laws are being considered. Most of them are radically tailored even at this early stage. For example, the draft law on resolving industrial disputes is clearly out of date, and this has been examined by one of the commissions. [Video shows sign on wall saying "Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policies Issues," camera scans room and focuses on unidentified deputy]

The information on the miners' strikes is getting out of date very quickly in the very same manner. Today, reports on work stoppages at Vrokuta, Dnepropetrovsk, Rostov-Don and Karaganda Mines reached the Supreme Soviet. It is exactly those processes which shape the course of discussions within the Supreme Soviet at the moment.

[Unidentified deputy] The task of our commission is now to identify these sore points, and these are, first and foremost, the housing problem, the problems with food supplies, consumer goods, of prices which keep growing. So it is these issues, or rather, the search for ways of resolving them, that are at the heart of the current work of our commission, along with improving the legal mechanism of those collective labor disputes.

[Orlov] For example, deputies have been examining the proposal to alter profit allocation structure for enterprises—something which has also been demanded by the miners.

This newspaper here is like a working document. You don't have the feeling that this law is going to be drafted in Moscow and not be acceptable to those who work out there—miners, workers?

[Gvozdev] Oh no, for me personally, I coordinate it with Mezhdurechensk. I am going to take a flight to Mezhdurechensk tomorrow, and the first thing I am going to do there is to go to the workers' committee, it is operating here [as heard], and we will work on drawing it up together. So, it is not going to be my decision. That decision [words indistinct] and that is the same way with everybody. A member of our commission has just taken a flight to Vorkuta after asking for the commission's permission. He also took with him our demands, his own demands, and his draft plans for them to be considered. And I very much ask—I have already telephoned there and said this—that [words indistinct] Let us together make sure that all the articles and all the requirements are....

[Orlov interrupting] Well-considered in every aspect.

[Gvozdev] Yes, in every aspect.

[Lukyanov] Well, we have now come to feel just how much such a mobile and constantly operating body is needed. No sooner had events developed in Kemerovo than the deputies—both Medikov and Deputy Druz—arrived. They arrived here straight from there and they made a whole series of proposals and voiced their opinions on this matter and, most importantly, they informed both the session of the Supreme Soviet and the whole people about what is happening there. And this gave the government, too, a chance to adopt vigorous measures at once. I am not mentioning the fact that the Supreme Soviet itself and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and his deputy chairman—we were phoning each other literally every hour and new the situation. But nevertheless we heard this from people's deputies. And it is very good that the people's deputies took control there, locally, of a number of sectors and attempted to lead that movement into a definite chanel. They both rebuffed the extremists and, at the same time, did everything so that things were organized, so that things remained calm.

If certian matters are to be decided for coal miners, for miners, for people who extract ore in pits, those matters can not be decided for one mining area [basseyn] alone. We declare firmly that these matters will be resolved for all coal miners of the country, for all mining areas, taking into consideration the specific features of, say, the polar mining area as one thing and the southern mining area as another thing. But, in principle, these matters will be resolved for everybody because here we must decide things both based on social justice and on a single approach to solution of such matters, and proceeding, of course, from the potentialities of the country.

Further on 20 Jul Meeting

LD2007172889 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Parliament committees and commissions today held their meetings at the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, according to a decision taken on Wednesday at a joint meeting of the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities of the Soviet parliament.

It was announced at the meeting of the Committee on Legislation, Law and Order that work will soon start on a long-term plan for law- making activities in the next five years.

Sergey Alexeyev, chairman of this permanent body of the Soviet parliament, attributed this decision to the need to prepare a package of normative acts regarding constitutional, economic, social, court and criminal legislation. He also noted that the proposals on drafting new laws, made during the congress of People's Deputies and the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, should be studied in detail. Such an analysis will make it more clear when new laws should be drafted and when changes should be made into existing normative acts.

The parliament committee on glasnost, rights and citizens' requests will discuss in the next few months the draft law on the press and other bodies of the mass media. It was noted at today's meeting that Soviet people will judge on the first results of the work of the committee by how effective this normative act is.

The draft law on quality and protection of the consumers' rights is high on the priority list of this committee. The MPs also plan to study the possibility of passing legislation to give people's deputies the right to address their constituencies through the mass media.

An unusual proposal was made at today's meeting of the committee on science, people's education, culture and upbringing by the well- known Soviet film-making Rolan Bykov. He favoured taking sanctions, including economic ones, against organisations and institutions whose activity does not correspond to the decisions of the parliament. In the ensuring debate members of the committee noted that this proposal needs to be revised. In particular, sanctions should be applied by the bodies of procurator's office rather than by the Supreme Soviet.

A decision was taken to put this proposal for discussion by the Committee on Legislation, Law and Order. The Committee on Science, People's Education, Culture and Upbringing already made a legislative initiative by proposing on Wednesday that the Soviet parliament cancel the decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet stripping prominent workers of culture and arts of citizenship.

Speaking about the committee's plans, its Deputy Chairman Sergey Ryabchenko noted that priority is given to offsetting the leftover principle of allocating finances for research, culture and education, which unfortunately prevails in the activity of executive agencies.

Tomorrow the parliamentary commissions and committees will continue their meetings.

20 Jul Committee Work Detailed

LD2007204189 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 20 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Meetings of parliamentary committees and commissions of the chambers were held today within the framework of the First Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The commission for consumer goods has a lot work to do, but the priority task today is the drawing up of a bill on the quality of products and the protection of consumers' rights which the current session will discuss. A new version of the bill (the first one was turned down by the commission) is about 200 pages long. However, it will hardly be adopted without amendments. According to Aleksander Obolenskiy, an engineer geophysicist, the renewed bill is hardly any better than the first one. Consumers' rights are understated in it, while those of producers are overstated.

Members of the commission came to a unanimous conclusion today that the bill should pass several rounds of discussion at various commissions before it is submitted for the consideration of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The committee on agrarian and food problems focused its attention on the decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted earlier which are the subject for approval, the laws on taxation, on cooperative activities and so on.

The committee held its session today at the USSR Agro-Industrial Bank (Agroprombank). Parliamentarians believe that it is impossible to manage modern economy without the information possessed by the bank.

People's deputies from the commission of the Council of the Union on Labour, Prices and Social Policy suggested effective measures against those cooperators who try to by-pass the law for mercenary purposes. Specifically, they recommend to fine them heavily if they understate profits, for the volume of the fine exceeds five-fold the sum concealed from taxation. The fines should be channelled to the state budget. The decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On Cooperatives' Income Tax" submitted for the consideration of the current session does not contain such tough sanctions.

Problems connected with the development of the cooperative movement were heatedly discussed at the session of the commission dealing with social problems. Some speakers insisted on a dramatic reduction of unjust, in their opinion, profits of trade and purchasing cooperatives and urged to increase taxes on them. Yuriy Chernichenko, a writer, did not agree with those deputies. He said that a possibility should be given to a skilled worker to increase his wages two- or three-fold, if he intends to do it by honest means. At the same time unsurmountable obstacles should be put on the way of speculators directly connected with underground business. And, of course, priority should be given to production cooperatives.

Another decree discussed today, the one that deals with taxes on individual transport facilities and other self-propelled machines and mechanisms, also started a lively discussion.

Deputies began the discussion of the bill "On the Order of settling Collective Labour Disputes."

18 Jul Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported
PM2007151989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by E. Gonzalyez, A. Illesh, Ye. Zhbanov, and V. Tolstov: "Decrees Are Being Discussed in USSR Supreme Soviet's Committees and its Chambers' Commissions"]

[Text] There is no doubt that there are things which generate heightened interest among the deputies. They include prices and taxes. The former and the latter were the subject of discussion 18 July, from different viewpoints, it is true. From morning three commissions and two committees with a graphically expressed socioeconomic tendency examined the candidacy for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices and after lunch they examined decrees on prices.

Let us recall that the deputies rejected the first candidate leader of the prices formation department. The new candidate, V.K. Senchagov, at present USSR deputy minister of finances, was presented by L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. He noted that Senchagov successfully combines experience as an economic scientist with practice in the state apparatus, he is approachable, receptive to different views, and inclined toward collective work and the search for solutions.

Vyacheslav Konstantinovich Senchagov honestly admitted that he had had just a week to prepare for this meeting and he himself had had no hand in the information on the state of price formation distributed to the deputies. But he subsequently demonstrated quite a good knowledge of the subject and the problems, answered questions without taking a long time for thought, and, the main thing, it seemed to us, he answered them frankly and sincerely. There were moments when it might possible have been more advantageous for the contender to be a little evasive. For instance, when he was asked about his attitude toward cooperative and some of the striking miners' economic demands. But Senchagov set forth in a reasoned manner his own view of the problems which did not coincide in all respects with the view which was obviously expected.

The contender's credo gradually took shape. He agrees with the universally accepted opinion that the prices system is neglected and unbalanced. Proposals for changing wholesale prices have already been submitted by the State Committee but there are some things—the deadlines for their introduction and the size of the increase—in these proposals which bother him. Purchase prices must be reviewed. But retail prices are the most complex thing. It is clear that at least for the next 2 years we must abandon the idea of increasing prices (even with full compensation). But it is also impossible simply to do nothing during this time. On the one hand it is essential to work out means of resisting the spontaneous rise in retail prices and on the other to to consider and possibly to implement by way of an experiment the idea of local markets with flexible prices.

There were many questions for the candidate. We can mention particular ones—on prices for combine harvesters and sanitary engineering—and general ones—about monopolism and price formation, the principles of price formation for the next 5 years, and so forth.

After 90 minutes' discussion the deputies decided to recommend V.K. Senchagov for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices.

On the same day a sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order was held in the "Moskva" hotel in specially allocated premises on the fourth floor. We asked the committee's chairman, S.S. Alekseyev, to briefly enlighten our readers about the range of problems discussed.

"As you know," he said, "the Supreme Soviet is faced with a very full workload to approve decrees and to examine a whole package of new legislative acts. That is why our committee must first of all determine a plan for our further work. We have consulted with each other and decided that the first point in our plan should be the draft laws which have already been submitted for discussion by the Supreme Soviet."

"And how many of these draft laws are there?"

"There are 11. Our subcommittee on constitutional legislation and political reform should give a conclusion on five draft laws and the subcommittee on court reform and criminal legislation should give a conclusion on six."

One sitting of the Supreme Soviet suggested determining in advance the order in which they are to be examined. What is your view?"

"We have already voiced our opinion. We believe that we must primarily discuss the draft laws connected with economic reform and the preparation of the Constitution. But first and foremost, so to speak, are the laws on forms of ownership, on a single taxation system, and on leasing. Our recommendations have been considered."

Tell me, Sergey Sergeyevich, does the draft law on forms of ownership not propose to some extent to break down into smaller units everything which we call nationwide property, which has essentially become no one's property?"

"It does. But I would not like to set out the details of the proposals which have not yet been adopted by the deputies. The laws on ownership, a unified taxation system, and leasing will help us move forward, partially break up, and animate the immobile bulk of state ownership."

The same committee sitting discussed, with the participation of Moscow State University specialists, the topical question of legal guarantees in voting with the use of computers, as is done in all civilized countries, and the practical use of computers in the legislative process with a view to accelerating it.

In concluding our talk S.S. Alekseyev asked us for one explanation. Alas, some citizens have formed a not entirely correct impression of the committee's aims and tasks. As we can see, they are confused by the final words of the name—"legality and law and order." And now, at a very strenuous time in the parliament's work, the committee has been deluged with a flood of complaints. S.S. Alekseyev asked us to make clear that the committee does not examine complaints on specific cases because that would mean usurping the supervisory bodies—the organs of the Prosecutor's Office and the USSR Supreme Soviet. The committee examines only those communications which touch on the principles of the law enforcement organs' work and their formation or on questions connected with the USSR Supreme Soviet's lawmaking activity.

The members of the USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees invited specialists from ministries and departments, cooperative chairmen, and scientists to the sitting after the intermission to discuss the decrees on taxation. And although the decrees under discussion, which it is planned to submit on Friday for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet, affect not only members of cooperatives but also citizens engaged in individual labor and the owners of transport facilities, the talk was nonetheless devoted from start to finish to the further fate of the cooperatives.

The positions of the drafters of the decrees were submitted by M.V. Shpilko, deputy chief of a department of the USSR Ministry of Finances. He said that so far taxes have been levied from cooperative members according to temporary norms and that the new decree does not contradict the law on cooperatives. The position of the Ministry of Finances comes down to saying that the cooperatives must be placed under more stringent tax terms which must be determined not by the center but by the local organs of power. They are granted the right to create at their discretion preferential terms for those cooperatives whose activity is assessed as being most useful.

Deputy V.A. Tikhonov asked what consequences the Ministry of Finances expects from the introduction of the new decree on taxes. The question put the representative of the financial organs in a difficult position. Then V.A. Tikhonov announced the figures of his forecast. In his opinion, the introduction of high taxes on cooperatives' incomes will lead primarily to an increase of 20-25 percent in prices for goods and services, will restrict the cooperative movement's opportunities for development, and push it toward the shadow economy. As a result there will be a reduction in the budget revenue from cooperatives and the problem will thus only be aggravated.

Deputy V.A. Tikhonov expressed himself in favor of creating a single taxation system in the country and until then he suggested preserving the existing taxation procedure. At the same time, in his opinion, it is essential to step up legal responsibility for speculation and to instruct the Ministry of Finances to create a qualitatively new tax inspectorate.

Deputy K.D. Prunskene expressed herself in favor of flexible taxation encouraging the development of the cooperative movement in the interests of society. In her opinion extremely high tax rates are an additional burden of expenditure for the population.

The position of the committee on questions of economic reform formed around these viewpoints. The position was supported by members of the Commission for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy. In his speech Doctor of Economic Sciences A.G. Zhuravlev criticized the authors of the law on taxation for their inability to forecast the consequences of financial policy.

The deputies listened with interest to the cooperative chairmen who had been invited. A.A. Panin, who has headed the Moscow City Soviet Commission for Cooperative and Individual Labor Activity for 3 years, cited statistics for Moscow on the extraordinarily rapid growth of the cooperative movement recently.

But will the new taxation allow this trend to be preserved? A.A. Panin cited figures for construction cooperatives' labor productivity. According to this indicator they surpass state construction organizations by a factor of four. So after that is it correct to raise the question of the excessively high earnings of cooperative members who, incidentally, in industry work according to state rates? Raising the tax rates for the cooperative member

in this case will be a punishment for working "too" well. But what if we act differently and borrow from the cooperative members their methods or organizing and encouraging labor and put the state construction organizations in similar conditions?

Much of what was said by the cooperative chairmen sounded like a revelation to the deputies. M.Ya. Ioffe, the leader of a scientific feasibility cooperative [nauchno-vnedrechenskiy kooperativ], said that these cooperatives are being created as an alternative to the stagnant state scientific system. But the average cost of a scientific development to the client, be it an enterprise, higher educational establishment, or collective farm, is three times cheaper in the cooperative than in a state scientific research institute while execution and introduction are six times cheaper.

After the discussion, which lasted over 4 hours, the deputies concluded that the problem of the taxation of cooperative members is in need of additional study. It was proposed that not only ministry and department specialists but also people's deputies take part in the direct elaboration of the decree's clauses.

...The first parliamentary hearing was held at a joint sitting of three USSR Supreme Soviet committees—on questions of ecology and the rational use of natural resources, on questions of defense and state security, and on science, public education, culture, and upbringing. There was a discussion of the tragedy which took place at the defense enterprise near Chelyabinsk 29 September 1957. (This situation was first described in the open Soviet press by IZVESTIYA in the item "30 Years before Chernobyl," in its No 194 issue).

Zhores Medvedev—the author of the book "Nuclear Disaster in the Urals" and now a leading staffer of the medical research institute in London—was invited to the hearings. Leaders of the Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and Industry and the Kurchatov institute, well known geneticists and radiologists, and representatives of the USSR Health Ministry also took part in the discussion. The aim of the hearings is to prepare a law on nuclear safety. Subsequently it is proposed to talk about the situation in Chernobyl, the problems of nuclear electric power stations, nuclear waste, underground explosions, and so forth....

Concluding the extraordinarily keen and useful exchange of opinions, Academician Ye. Velikhov said: "Life has unambiguously proved to everyone that the secrecy which enmeshed the tragedy in the South Urals cost our public and Soviet science dear. Nothing of the kind should be repeated in the future...."

17 Jul Supreme Soviet Session Proceedings Relayed

Problems Facing Gosplan Noted

LD1707174789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1410 GMT on 17 July begins broadcasting a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Moscow Kremlin.

At the start of the relay Lukyanov outlines the agenda for the 17 July session and introduces Durasov to speak on his candidacy for the post of first deputy chairman of the Gosplan.

Durasov speaks of the responsibilities of the post for which he is applying and outlines his tasks for Gosplan's work in improving the state of the economy. He goes on to outline what in his view constitutes some of the main obstacles to progress in the economic sphere and stresses the need to work hard to overcome them. Among the priorities are food production and machine building. There is a need for machines in rural areas. He says health and ecology are also priority areas. Capital construction is also mentioned. What has been allowed to lag behind in the sphere of housing construction can, perhaps, not be made up, he says. These tasks have to be resolved in the coming years, in the 13th 5-Year Plan. Science and technical progress must be aimed at saving resources. Secondary resources must be utilized. Durasov says he is sure that these tasks can be resolved.

At 1432 GMT Lukyanov asks for questions. Deputy Yetylen from the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug takes the rostrum and asks about the introduciton of technical proceses and the improvement of social conditions in his area, the north of the country, with particular reference to the mining settlements of his constituency. He outlines some of the social problems in the mining sector. He recommends approving Durasov's candidacy.

At 1438 GMT, Deputy Ivanov from Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] takes the rostrum. He stresses that there are a great many problems in the north of the country, particularly regarding housing and social conditions. Health and life expectancy are also at a low level in these areas. Gosplan must tackle these problems, he says. Representatives of the areas in question have to take part in drawing up programs for resolving these problems. He draws Durasov's attention to the fact that pensioners in the south and in the north get the same pensions. He also supports Durasov's candidacy.

At 1444 GMT, Lukyanov asks deputies to vote on Durasov's candidacy. With 389 deputies taking part in the session, there are 7 abstentions, and none against. Durasov is appointed. Lukyanov introduces the next point on the agenda: Panichev's candidacy for the post of minister of the machine tool building industry. Panichev takes the rostrum.

At 1447 GMT, Panichev speaks of the importance of the machine tool building industry, and some of the problems that afflict the sector. A strategic line has been worked out to cut production of outmoded technology and increase the share of more modern machines. His action plan stresses encouraging the development of initiative. New methods and forms of economic work

must be worked out, he says. Housing construction in the sector must be boosted. The health program must be implemented. Labor and leisure conditions must be improved. Panichev calls for: investment in the area of retooling the production process; ecologically clean production, quicker supply of machinery to the food processing sectors. He says some of the machinery output being released by the conversion of defense capacity has to be directed toward hi-tech equipment. Aid from the central organs will be needed, Panichev notes. He goes on to reply to written questions. There is a question about Soviet production and export of high-precision equipment which he says will be increased. When asked the values of machine tool building equipment sold and bought abroad he provides figures.

Delegates Favor, Elect Panichev

LD1707182589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian on 17 July continues a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

At 1501 GMT Deputy Miloserdnyy from Belorussia takes the rostrum. He stresses the importance of the machine tool building industry for the development of other sectors, but the problems in this key sphere are great. He calls for accelerated development in this area. He calls for support for Panichev's candidacy, stressing his fine qualities and achievements, but calls for work to be done in particular in the areas of social conditions and housing.

At 1507 GMT Deputy Magomedov from Daghestan takes the rostrum. He speaks of the development of the machine building industry in his constituency, and calls for a particular enterprise in his area to be continued in line with the mandate of his electorate. He calls for Panichev to be supported.

At 1509 GMT Deputy Nikanorov from Ryazan takes the rostrum and makes a point about the status and work of the ministry.

At 1513 GMT Deputy Kharchenko from Zaporozhye stresses the problems that afflict individual enterprises in the machine building sector and the effect this has on the economy as a whole. He says he will vote for Panichev, but the structure of the machine tool stock has to be reviewed.

At 1516 GMT Deputy Danilenko from Kiev Oblast takes the rostrum. He stresses the importance of producing such things as washing powder, etc. Lukyanov asks him if he is really speaking on Panichev's candidacy. He continues, but with just as little relevance to the matter in hand.

At 1520 GMT a deputy from the floor expresses his support for Panichev, but asks why Ryzhkov is now recommending him, in view of his past dissatisfaction with Panichev's work. Ryzhkov agrees that there was dissatisfaction that the sector was being restructured too slowly, but following consultations and expressions of support from people in the sector, it was decided to back Panichev for the post. He is confident that Panichev will justify deputies' trust.

At 1529 GMT a deputy from the floor (?Belyayev) asks about the conversion of enterprises from defense production. Ryzhkov replies. The deputy recommends support for Panichev.

At 1531 GMT Lukyanov calls for deputies to vote: There are 3 against and 18 abstentions. Panichev is voted in.

At 1533 GMT Lukyanov says the session has received requests for certain candidacies to be reviewed, including that of Polad-Zade for the post of minister of water industry construction. Ryzhkov is called upon to speak on the matter. He notes the complexity of Polad-Zade's candidacy. He gives some of the background to the recommendation of Polad-Zade for the post. Ryzhkov is most positive about the candidacy. He speaks of the ideal background and fine work of Polad-Zade. Ryzhkov admits that there have been errors in the area of land improvement. It is natural that Polad-Zade, who was first deputy minister at the time, should be associated with the situation that arose. Ryzhkov notes the question now is whether he is able to do the job. Ryzhkov says he is convinced that he is. There had been proposals to eliminate this ministry, but it was felt that this would not solve the problem and the ministry was left in existence. He notes great ecological problems in water areas such as the Volga which will require great expenditure, and Polad-Zade had supported measures to improve the environment in spite of opposition within his own ministry. Ryzhkov is confident that Polad-Zade will be up to the job in the future. He cites examples of his fine work.

At 1548 GMT Lukyanov asks for other positions on the question of reviewing the candidacy. Deputy Salykov takes the rostrum and says the candidacy should not be reviewed, it should be done in the committees—there is applause. Deputy Filshin takes the floor and stresses the unpopular policies of the ministry in question in the past, and calls for the candidacy not to be reviewed.

At 1552 GMT Deputy Veprev gives some background to the discussion of the candidacy in the committees and calls for a review.

At 1554 GMT Lukyanov tries to sum up: There are views on both sides, so there has to be a vote. A deputy from the floor expresses his view on the matter. There is an attempt to vote but Yeltsin takes the floor. He says this is an ethical issue. He does not want the matter discussed today. Lukyanov tries to take the vote again. He asks who is in favor of discussing the matter today? There are 125 for and 24 abstentions. There is some confusion about the figures, but a majority are against

discussing the matter today. It is noted that 187 were against, which adds up to 336, which means some deputies must have left.

Nepotism Issue Brought to Fore

LD1707193589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian on 17 July continues a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

At 1602 GMT Lukyanov reads some letters from deputies supporting Zakharov's candidacy, other letters about transport, railways matters; government composition; on Kamentsev; on the way speeches have been made, and misunderstood.

At 1611 GMT Ryzhkov takes the floor on the issue of Kamentsev's candidacy for Council of Ministers' deputy chairman. Deputy Savchenko addresses the same issue. He says his previous speech was misunderstood; he talks about the work of Kamentsev in a critical vein; he scrutinizes the shortcomings in the apparatus, system, and the work of ministries and departments connected with Kamentsev. He refers to the 1986 plenum which mentioned high numbers of relatives in, for example, the Foreign Affairs Ministry, and subsequent similar discoveries. He says he received letters from people about such high levels of relatives in same departments.

At 1619 GMT Savchenko says nepotism has always worried people. If investigations show that such does not exist, then rumors can be squashed. Matter needs to be investigated. He asks the Supreme Soviet to adopt a decision to investigate for nepotism Kamentsev-connected sectors. He asks that a special commission be created.

At 1623 GMT Sanchenko names the son of Kamentsev and his post and the son of another top official.

At 1623 GMT he mentions the son of an official working in the Chamber of Commerce, and other sons. He says he has a list of more than 20 children of generals, etc which needs to be checked out by deputies. There is applause. He quotes a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA article on the same subject. He has the paper in front of him. The name in question is Melnikov.

At 1626 GMT Ryzhkov takes the floor and says Kamentsev is going off on pension with a stained or different character. He says he will dwell on three questions: He recalls the 14 July session and quotes from Katushev's speech; he recalls other matters from that session, and Deputy (?Sopchak's) criticism of Kamentsev. The third matter concerns Kamentsev and a bribery case—he recalls this, not giving specific names here so as not to embarrass innocent people.

At 1635 GMT Lukyanov announces a break after which what Ryzhkov said will be discussed.

At 1636 GMT the session resumes. Deputy Khadzhiyev takes the floor on Kamentsev's candidacy, and supports him. Those accusations made at this forum are not justified, he says.

At 1639 GMT Lukyanov says that Khadzhiyev is suggesting Kamentsev, not to blame for any nepotism in ministries. He suggests the Supreme Soviet will consider the matter in committee.

At 1641 GMT an unidentified deputy takes the floor on Kamentsev and supports him.

At 1641 GMT Deputy Zakharov, culture minister, takes the floor.

At 1642 GMT Zakharov says deputies have questioned whether a culture ministry is needed. He talks about the formation of commissions in relation to cultural matters. The structure covering cultural matters needs to be changed, he says.

At 1645 GMT Deputy Gramov takes the floor, answering an accusation levelled at him about his work, mentioning newspaper articles on the subject. The accusation has never been found to have grounds, he says. He mentions pressure from Baltic republic representatives about sports issues and their republics' representation in sports. They said they would only vote for him if he supported them. He mentions good work by the sports committee in which he is involved. He says he is soon to go on pension. He says there are still many shortcomings concerning sports amenities.

At 1651 GMT Lukyanov says Ryzhkov will soon speak on forming the government, but first a few more deputies will speak.

Ryzhkov Speaks

LD1707203189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian on 17 July continues a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

At 1652 GMT Deputy V.N. Stepanov takes the floor talking about problems in all spheres of the Soviet economy—he lists some of them in transport, fisheries, education, the food sector, machinery sector. Sensible use of natural resources is needed, as is sensible planning. People await new and good work from the Supreme Soviet. He notes agriculture needs more investment. He suggests holding a congress for agricultural workers, with government members' participation, to thrash out problems. He talks about wages and pay for ministers—Ryzhkov has not yet said anything on this.

At 1701 GMT Deputy Amanova takes the floor, saying the cabinet is almost formed. Relays on television, etc have shown people that candidates have had some pretty

stiff questioning. She lists some of the complaints levelled at some ministers at the session.

At 1703 GMT Amanova mentions some of Ryzhkov's remarks; issues covered at last week's session, such as the Aral Sea; and her own work in the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. She makes suggestions on the work of the committee on social issues. She suggests meetings between deputies and government members in the morning.

At 1707 GMT an unidentified deputy from Kazakhstan takes the floor, raising issues of pay for work done; he recalls a 16 July PRAVDA item on the same question. He says Ryzhkov should appeal to the nation, instill faith in the working classes. He wishes the new government success.

At 1710 GMT an unidentified deputy takes the floor, taking issue with what Zakharov said on culture. He lists problems in society, noting a deficit of culture in the country. Monuments are being neglected, etc. He blames the management of culture, the lack of good ideas and programs. More work and discussion on this subject needed, he says.

At 1713 GMT Deputy Kobzon takes the floor, continuing on the subject of culture. He blames the culture minister for shortcomings in this sphere.

At 1717 GMT Deputy (?Sevastyuk) takes the floor, supporting and praising Zakharov.

At 1719 GMT Deputy Ivashko takes the floor after Lukyanov says that discussion of Zakharov's candidacy is over. Ivashko talks about candidacies to date and the procedure for submission, and consideration on the candidacy for chairman of Council of Ministers.

At 1721 GMT Lukyanov asks for an end to discussion. A vote is taken and a majority are for ending discussion and allowing Ryzhkov to speak.

At 1722 GMT Ryzhkov takes the floor and expresses thanks for deputies' work so far. He talks about the work of the government, the legislative and executive powers of parliament, and efficiency.

At 1731 GMT Ryzhkov says that in 3 weeks' work the Supreme Soviet has brought to light many problems which concern the people. A good picture has emerged of the state of the country and what needs to be done, but all the problems of the country can't be resolved at once. Priorities need to be established. Measures need to be taken to improve people's lives. He says agriculture, food shortages, and pay in that sector are a main priority area.

At 1736 GMT Ryzhkov says the right conditions need to be established to ensure the dynamic development of the country, a country rich in natural resources. People are not to blame—the existing system is. He says methods of force will not work to improve matters--only consolidation of all forces working within the law.

At 1739 GMT Ryzhkov says the social sphere has been widely covered by the sessions of the Supreme Soviet, and rightly so. He says Voronin should get involved in improvements in the consumer goods sector. Concern voiced over culture, women's situation have been rightly raised by the Supreme Soviet sessions. Ryzhkov says more needs to be done for women—a department on this needs to be created. There is applause.

At 1743 GMT Ryzhkov says enormous work lies ahead: The social and economic development plan for 1990, the 13th 5-Year Plan period, needs to be worked out; a new law on pensions needs to be worked out by November; he outlines a great deal of other work which lies ahead.

At 1747 GMT Ryzhkov says that the forming of the new government has been completed. On behalf of the government he thanks the deputies for support.

At 1748 GMT the Ryzhkov speech ends.

Kuzbass Strike Situation Viewed

LD1707220889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian on 17 July continues a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

At 1749 GMT Deputy Medikov from the Kuzbass takes the floor. He talks about the situation of striking miners there. He supports the workers of the Kuzbass and their demands, saying he holds in his hands 17 decisions on Kuzbass demands. A Slyunkov-led delegation has gone to the Kuzbass. He reads out suggestions and information on the strike. He details proposals made to resolve strike-related problems.

At 1758 GMT Medikov speaks on ecological problems in the Kuzbass region, and on self-management of coal and metal resources so as to improve conditions locally—more schools, for example. In conclusion, he calls on strikers to end the strike and let formed committees continue negotiations on raised issues.

At 1800 GMT Medikov ends his speech. Ryzhkov gets up to reply to Medikov's speech. He recalls his trip to the Kuzbass earlier this year and discusses the miners' grievances, dividing them into three parts: immediate pension problems, social neglect, and the provision of everyday goods.

At 1812 GMT Ryzhkov reads out and answers two written questions concerning payments for harvest work not being made and the failure of his final report earlier in the day to reflect the activity of cooperatives. He says from 1 July all cooperative tax affairs will be handed over to republics and other regional authorities. Any tax concessions for cooperatives need to be investigated further.

At 1815 GMT an unidentified deputy on the floor asks about the need for action like that needed for Kemerovo—he asks that aid be extended to other mining areas before the situation becomes as acute as in Kemerovo. Ryzhkov agrees that the Supreme Soviet should deal with the problems for all regions—simultaneously.

At 1818 GMT Lukyanov announces the close of that session and a break until 1630 GMT.

At 1819 GMT the next session starts after Lukyanov has ascertained that a quorum of 362 people is present. Yuriy Gennadiyevich Matveyev took the floor in his capacity as chief arbiter to explain the activity of the arbitration board. He took questions concerning IZVESTIYA's misgivings about the arbitration board's work.

At 1826 GMT Deputy Kolmakov comes forward to give the commission's approval for the six nominations for member of the collegium of the state arbitration board, five of them recommended unanimously, and one with reservations about his age, in this case deemed to be no bar.

At 1829 GMT a deputy from Komi ASSR calls upon the state arbitration board to act in a more principled and independent way than previously and to take on a greater role than before, to pick up on economic mismanagement throughout the economy. He also recommends the nomination of the collegium.

At 1834 GMT an unidentified deputy says he has no doubt about the qualities of the nominees for the collegium, but he reinforces the call for a better performance from the board than was formerly the case. He would have liked to have seen nominees from the regions, particularly Central Asia, for the board.

At 1836 GMT a follow up question addressed to Kolmakov raises objections to approving an elderly Russian member of the board, while regions such as Kazakhstan fail to be represented. Lukyanov moves on to approve Matveyev as chief state arbitrator, V.N. (Isaychev) as first deputy. There are no votes against (Isaychev) and four abstentions. Deputy Arbitrator (?V.V. Grebelnikov is considered next.

At 1842 GMT there is a break in reception.

At 1848 GMT reception is restored during a vote for members of the arbitration board. All are approved.

At 1850 GMT G.V. Kolbin reports on the discussions of the people's control committee nominations in his commission, outlining the main areas of concern to the people's control committee and noting improvements in its functions in recent times, although further improvements are still needed. He says the commission recommends most of the nominees. Substitute nominees were put forward in place of those not recommended, although one subsequently withdrew for family reasons. Kolbin says, one place has therefore been left vacant of the 20 places on the people's control committee.

At 1902 GMT Kolbin is asked questions: A deputy notes that only one of the nominees is not a party member, and the lack of regional representatives. Kolbin replies that Communists are also citizens and that obviously the national minorities are underrepresented. Deputy Podziruk notes that there is no armed forces representative on the committee. Kolbin explains that a special department deals with the armed forces' control. Logunov of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA comes forward to ask the people's control committee to investigate the supply and freighting of Soviet oil to a West German company at nominal prices which is then resold at full price.

People's Control Committee Viewed

LD1707223689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian on 17 July continues a recorded relay of the 17 July session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

At 1912 GMT S.Ya. Naumov from Chelyabinsk Oblast takes the floor. He reminds people that during Kolbin's confirmation debates the need for people's control to be subordinate and accountable only to the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet was stressed, thus eradicating abuses which had previously existed.

At 1916 GMT Deputy Mukhtarov rises to question the involvement of newspaper editors en masse on the people's control committee. He suggests that journalists writing every day should be more involved.

At 1918 GMT the debate closes with words from N.D. Pivovarov, on behalf of the commission on the work of Soviets of People's Deputies, development of government and self-government. He relates the process of committee discussion of Kolbin's nominees.

At 1922 GMT Lukyanov closes debates to move on to the vote, noting that some legal questions had been raised about people's control bodies, and endorsing the people's control committee's authority as a body under the Supreme Soviet. He moves on to the voting. All nominees are approved by majority voting.

At 1945 GMT Lukyanov, on completion of voting for the people's control committee, tells deputies that the International Affairs Committee intends to present to the Supreme Soviet for ratification several international documents beginning 24 July. He outlines the procedure for committee consideration of the documents prior to that date. Responding to requests, Lukyanov gives further details of the documents, which include Soviet-Turkish agreements. Each deputy is to be informed of committee debates in advance to decide if he wishes to attend, and each will receive the text of the documents to peruse.

At 1952 GMT Deputy Yeltsin rises to ask: That the international committee and other committees of the Supreme Soviet should approve proposed documents prior to there being agreed upon abroad during the course of a visit; and that the Supreme Soviet should be informed, on completion of the visit in question, of its outcome. He passes the suggestion on to the International Affairs Committee.

At 1955 GMT the chairman of the International Affairs Committee notes the importance of keeping deputies informed about international visits and agreements and proposes a provisional arrangement pending more permanent arrangements. It is agreed that this should concern state visits, not party affairs.

At 1959 GMT Lukyanov reads out a resolution instructing the International Affairs Committee to consider and submit for subsequent ratification in the Supreme Soviet the international documents referred to earlier. This is passed unanimously.

At 2001 GMT the relay ends.

Next Supreme Soviet Session Planned for 24 Jul

LD2007150589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] We open our regular review program with the report that for today and tomorrow, the work of the people's deputies has been transferred to the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the permanent commissions of the chambers. Deputies will gather for a joint sitting on 24 July.

IZVESTIYA interviews Yeltsin on Goals, Plans

PM2107083589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions, by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Tolstov under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet": "The Solution of Social Problems Brooks No Delay"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Tolstov] Boris Nikolayevich, your committee has been active for several days now. Perhaps a range of problems that will have be be attended to first and foremost in the sphere of construction and architecture has already emerged?

[Yeltsin] Yes, we have defined our tasks, and not just our priority tasks, but also those which are calculated for the longer term. We believe that changing investment policy in capital construction is something that brooks no delay. It is necessary to resolutely reorient it in favor of the social sphere. Hundreds of resolutions concerning industrial installations whose construction has not yet begun will have to be rescinded. It may also become necessary to suspend the construction of a number of vast, multimillion ruble projects. We believe that having cut back the volume of industrial construction funded by state capital investments by 30-40 percent, the thus released resources should be channeled into the solution of social problems. It is necessary to expand the construction of housing, hospitals, schools, and kindergartens—that is, everything that serves to enhance people's living standards. A certain proportion of capital investments should be taken out of the budget altogether so as not to promote inflation and to strengthen the ruble.

Finally, the reduction of industrial construction will make it possible to realize a long-standing dream of construction workers—to balance the plan with the material resources so that every construction site is provided with everything that is needed. Part of the released construction materials should be channeled into the trade network.

These are just some of the considerations that make us attribute paramount importance to the solution of this problem. The longer-term tasks comprise the elaboration of a number of draft laws designed to establish order in the sphere of construction and architecture.

[Tolstov] Are you happy about the composition of your committee and the way in which it has embarked on its work?

[Yeltsin] The formation of the committee was muddled. It embarked on its work without a brief. We have an imprecise notion of our rights and our obligations. The committee is composed of 46 people—23 deputies from each chamber of the Supreme Soviet. as chairman, I had no part in the committee's formation. I still do not know who selected the deputies or on what basis. I was presented with the ready-made list by the Supreme Soviet Presidium apparatus.

During the first sessions we agreed that from now on the committee would itself attend to the selection of the people on it. The committee's membership is not something that has been decided once and for all. We will attract active deputies to our ranks, and to those who fail to prove their worth we will suggest that they find a job with which they can cope. All committee members have agreed to this. We have already gotten to know each other: Each deputy has given an account of himself and expressed his view on the capital construction situation and how we should operate. Interesting proposals were made. Subcommittees for rural and individual construction, architecture and urban development, and a new investment policy have been set up.

[Tolstov] How do you picture the committee's place within the power structure, and its mutual relations with executive organs, and especially with the USSR Council of Ministers?

[Yeltsin] In our opinion, a Supreme Soviet standing committee should be a legislative and monitoring organ.

The Council of Ministers cannot expect us simply to assist it in the capacity of a consultative organ. The committee can instruct the Council of Ministers to elaborate and examine specific proposals. No major construction project should be started without committee approval, given after exhaustive examination of all possible consequences. In general, we believe that a law on capital construction is necessary. How is it possible that, without land having been allocated, the construction of four major chemical complexes has already started in Tyumen Oblast? Such situations should be prevented by law. Otherwise departmentalism rules supreme, paying no attention to either the economy or the ecology.

[Tolstov] Will the committee which you head supervise the implementation of the housing program covering through the year 2000?

[Yeltsin] We regard this as our priority. We take the view that industrial construction already has reliable guardians in the shape of ministries, departments, and enterprises. Civil engineering, and above all housing construction, must have an equally reliable buttress in the USSR Supreme Soviet committee.

As for the housing program itself, it is a long way to the implementation of the ringing slogan "To each family its own appartment by the year 2000." It is impossible to resolve this problem with the means and resources allocated under the 13th and 14th 5-Year Plans. These plans have had to be revised. For instance, instead of the envisaged 700 million square meters of housing we will have to build 1 billion square meters in the 13th 5-Year Plan. Yet where is the corresponding production base? It cannot be created overnight. Under Khrushchev it took 20 years to create a base for the construction of 50 million square meters of large-panel house buildings. Yet we have to add 100 million in the space of 4 years. Otherwise we can "write off" the program. I am not saying that the program is unrealistic, but the difficulties connected with its implementation are colossal.

[Tolstov] Millions of people currently live in "Khrushchev era" 5-story appartment blocks. If it is true that their lifespan is coming to an end, what is the fate of these houses and their inhabitants?

[Yeltsin] There are three options: reconstruction, complete demolition, or repairs to make them serviceable in the future. I have inspected these houses. There are many of them in Moscow's Sevastopolskiy Rayon in particular. The state of the 5-story blocks is pitiful. And their inhabitants' mood matches it. The solution to this problem cannot be put off for long.

[Tolstov] Where does your committee work and where is the chairman's office? Can an ordinary voter turn to you with a proposal, or can he, for instance, call Yeltsin?

[Yeltsin] For the moment we have been allocated premises in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium building on Prospekt Kalinina. Frankly speaking, they are inconvenient premises which are unsuitable for work. I regard this as a serious miscalculation on the Supreme Soviet Presidium apparatus' part, against which in general the deputies have many complaints.

I believe that it should be possible to find more suitable premises for the committee's work in buildings that are being vacated in connection with the reduction in the ministerial and departmental apparatus.

My office is here, where we are now, in Room 606 of the "Moskva" Hotel. I do not know how I am supposed to receive voters when a pass-system is in operation in the hotel.

As for proposals, the committee will welcome any useful initiative. And what is more, we intend to organize expert groups to which we will invite the most prestigious specialists to draw up draft laws or monitoring actions. No constructive proposal will be ignored. I believe we will manage to resolve the question of funding such groups—the question of the experts' labor remuneration, in other words.

Any voter can call me. Even now, as you have been able to see for yourself, they are calling constantly. My number is 292-72-73.

[Tolstov] Will the committee strive for glasnost in its work?

[Yeltsin] Without fail. Voters must know what we are working on and how we are tackling it. I believe that something like the following procedure, for instance, is needed: We would welcome it if we were given 90 minutes of television time once every 2 weeks. We could then present key questions for viewers' assessment, provide comments, and brief them on our work. We are in favor of IZVESTIYA becoming the organ of the Congress, and of its chief editor being elected at the Congress. This would guarantee glasnost.

[Tolstov] You said at the Supreme Soviet session that you agreed to the proposal to head the committee with certain misgivings. What was the cause of these misgivings?

[Yeltsin] At first it seemed to me that my election as the committee's chairman was a pretext for removing me from direct political work. However, I will not give up this work. I will continue to engage in political activity, despite the increased work load.

It was impossible to embark on this work without misgivings while not knowing the committee's rights. If it has the right to veto ill-conceived construction projects, then it is an organ in its own right. However, if the deputies say "no" and someone in an executive office

signs the order and construction begins, then our role is reduced to that of mere formalities.

Another problem is that we are all new to parliamentary work. We are beginning from scratch. Experience of life and political work is no substitute for parliamentary experience. We have to learn. I am thinking of asking the Supreme Soviet to enable committee members to visit a number of countries to familiarize themselves with the practice of resolving urban development problems and also with the experience of parliamentary work as such.

Estonia's 'Interfront' Calls for 21 Jul Strike

LD2007173389 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 1600 GMT 20 Jul 89

[From the "Echo" program; live relay by Thomas Nordegren in Helsinki]

[Text] Interfront, which represents Estonia's Russian-speaking population, asked the other day to be allowed to arrange a big demonstration. They wanted to demonstrate in Freedom Square in Tallinn on Friday, 21 July, to celebrate the anniversary of the establishment of Soviet power in Estonia in 1940. The Tallinn city administration has banned the demonstration on the grounds that it would take place during working hours and that it would disrupt traffic. But last evening the leaders of Interfront responded that they would defy the ban, and they have proclaimed a strike among the Russian-speaking workers on Friday so that they can take part in the demonstration.

Estonia's population today consists roughly of the same number of Russian-speaking immigrants and Estonians. The Interfront movement holds that the rights of the Russian-speaking people are now being threatened by the law on Estonian citizenship, which is to be discussed by the Estonian Supreme Soviet next week. The new law requires, among other things, that a person must have lived in Estonia for a set period in order to be able to vote in the elections in this union republic.

To gather in the Estonian capital to celebrate Estonia's forced annexation by Stalin into the Soviet Union is seen as a grave provocation by those who have been fighting for increased autonomy for Estonia. The moderate forces in the CPSU and in the Council of Ministers are now doing everything possible to avoid an open confrontation on Friday. The authorities are calling on the people not to go out onto the streets on Friday, but to stay at home. Sources within the Estonian People's Front told "Echo" today that they regard Interfront's demonstration as a malicious step intended to create unrest in the streets and provoke clashes between Estonians and Russians in order to get an excuse to introduce emergency laws.

Ethnic Clashes, Unrest Continue in Abkhaziya

'Extremists' Seize Weapons

LD2107075289 Moscow TASS in English 0744 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov: The situation in Abkhaziya and adjoining areas of Georgia remains tense, according to the USSR Interior Ministry. Forty nine people were detained for curfew violations last night.

Over 200 weapons were confiscated on Thursday. In Kaspskiy district extremists attacked an Interior Ministry department and stole 30 confiscated hunting guns. An attack on the paramilitary guard of several enterprises was staged in the city of Samtredia. Weapons, including automatic weapons, fell into the hands of extremists.

Tourists continue to be moved out of this area. Women and children are the first to leave. Law enforcement forces prompt action ensured that there was not a single attack on tourists.

IZVESTIYA Updates Situation

PM2007175589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Special correspondent Vl. Arsenyev report: "Abkhaziya: Tension Persists"]

[Text] Sukhumi, 20 Jul—The situation in the Abkhazian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR], which remains complex and uneasy even after the introduction of the special regime [osobyy rezhim] for citizens' conduct, is at the center of attention of all inhabitants of Georgia, of course. The republic's mass media are transmitting reports prepared by the Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] press service. A considerable portion is alloted to commentaries that time and again return to the details of the tragic events of July 15 and 16.

Those who saw the "Vremya" program on 19 July and heard the conversation with Georgian Interior Minister Sh. Gorgodze know that the death toll at that time was 16. But another person, seriously injured the day before not far from Gudauta, died that day. The republic's TV station showed a program filmed in Sukhumi that confirmed the vandalism and extreme anger seen during clashes on nonworking days and caused, it was stressed, by anti-Georgian feelings.

The alienation between Georgians and Abkhazians and the mutual distrust are unfortunately increasing, as I saw for myself yesterday on a number of occasions while talking with the two sides. Even a simple account of the facts of a single day—17 July—in issue 199 of IZVESTIYA caused objections among the Georgian population, because the information was obtained from the Abkhazian oblast party committee.

Party and soviet organs and USSR MVD internal troops are managing with difficulty to contain the seething passions, especially in rural regions. Teams at the Sukhumi locomotive depot are on strike. The situation has again become inflamed in rayons of West Georgia. Public transport has stopped in Kutaisi and Zugdidi. People are gripped by blind fury and are filled with the lust for revenge in the belief that they are defending a just cause. And, as a rule, they do not think about the fact that perhaps the tragedy was caused by someone's carefully conceived and rehearsed scheme pursuing the sole aim of driving a wedge between neighboring peoples and plunging Abkhaziya and Georgia into an abyss of endless feuds in which the democratization of social life and the just solution of social problems will be forgotten. Life is already difficult now for Soviet man, be he Russian or Georgian, Abkhazian or Armenian. But for some people even that is not enough. They are poisoning the mind with national exclusiveness and inciting people to close ranks and fight, promising them heaven on earth after their rivals are forcibly removed.

The latest reports from the USSR MVD press center were obtained by me on the morning of 20 July. The situation has remained tense in the autonomous republic in the past 24 hours. Small-scale skirmishes and clashes involving weapons occurred during the day in Gulripshskiy, Ochamchirskiy, and Sukhumskiy Rayons. Picketing of roads and bridges continued. As a result, over 100 motor vehicles piled up at the bridge across the River Mokva in Ochamchirskiy Rayon. The bulk of enterprises are not working. Public transport is not operating. But Sukhumi airport is actively operating.

Order on the streets is being maintained by subunits of the USSR MVD internal troops, militia, and militia schools. The most important facilities have been taken under control. All this is in complete keeping with the special regime for citizens' conduct throughout the territory of the Abkhaz ASSR adopted by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers of the Abkhaz ASSR on 18 July.

The resolution says, in particular, that the assembly of people on the streets and squares of all population centers and the holding of rallies and processions are forbidden. The keeping of firearms, explosive materials, and incendiary compounds is forbidden. All citizens are instructed to immediately hand in firearms in their possession, those guilty of not doing so will be detained by the USSR MVD troops and have criminal proceedings instituted against them. Abkhaz ASSR city and rayon soviet executive committees are instructed to draw up specific measures to ensure absolute fulfillment of the resolution. It will operate until adoption of a special resolution by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers of the Abkhaz ASSR.

Further facts from the USSR MVD press center. The following was seized from an abandoned well in the village of Shroma, Sukhumskiy Rayon: 102 kg of explosives, 130 detonators, and 120 meters of fuse wire. And altogether throughout the period the following has been seized: 345 firearms, including 39 rifle-bored weapons; 306 hunting guns; 214 kg of explosives; 7,032 cartridges, including 5,911 for rifled-bored weapons; and 39 homemade explosive devices.

These are the facts. But my first impression in Sukhumi on the morning of 20 July reminded me a great deal of a peaceful way of life. People on the embankment were drinking coffee and eating ice cream, and the latest newspapers, which had not been seen in Sukhumi since the weekend, were on sale here.

Sukhumi Situation Said Stabilizing

LD2007164289 Moscow TASS in English
1615 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Sukhumi, Abkhaziya, July 20 TASS—Most enterprises as well as public and railway transport are idle for the fourth day in Sukhumi, capital of the Autonomous Republic of Abkhaziya on the Black Sea coast and the scene of recent interethnic clashes. Sukhumi's streets are being patrolled by troops in bullet-proof vests and helmets and armed with submachine-guns.

The flow of tourists to Abkhazian resorts was restricted today due to the complexity of the socio-political situation and persisting tension.

An emergency regime imposed throughout Abkhaziya restricts movements during the night, bans rallies and marches and binds citizens to turn in any weapons at their disposal. Security presence during the night is increased to enforce the curfew.

The situation in Abkhaziya is gradually stabilising. The Sukhumi Airport maintains busy operations. It sent out 16 flights on Wednesday, bringing more than 1,500 passengers to 18 different cities. More people are being flown out of the area.

Buses leaving from sanatoriums, guest homes and children's summer camps for the airport are given militia escorts.

In Sukhumi and other Abkhazian towns bread is sold in sufficient quantities.

In Gudauta, Novyy Afon and Gagriy the situation is calmer, with strolling holiday-makers and some shops staying open, even though their shelves don't make one especially optimistic.

The Soviet Interior Ministry's information service in its daily press release described the situation in Abkhaziya on Wednesday as still tense, reporting skirmishes involving weapons in the Gulripshi, Ochamchiri and Sukhumi areas.

Civilians continued to picket highways and bridges there, despite measures adopted to prevent this, and caused a heavy jam at the bridge across the Mokva River in the Ochamchiri district.

It is very alarming that the population still keeps many firearms, and Interior Ministry troops are continuing to confiscate them.

Ethnic Clashes Described

PM2007123589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jul 89 p 4

[Special Correspondent Ye. Zhirnov report: "...Trouble by the Sea"]

[Text] Sukhumi—The ethnic conflict between Georgians and Abkhazians was coming to a head in the autonomous republic long ago.

The leadership of the Abkhaz People's Forum twice asked the organs of power to impose a curfew and a special administration regime. On 15 July the crowds on the streets numbered over 3,000.

Throughout Sukhumi there were mass clashes involving the use of firearms, which continued on 16 July.

Militia workers in all rayons were forced to yield to the demands of people who, racked by mutual fear and rumors, surrounded the rayon internal affairs department and demanded that the hunting weapons taken from them earlier be returned for their self-defense.

The strikes are continuing and there are bread lines in the morning. Interruptions in the supply of food are becoming apparent. Transport is not operating. This is the 5th day that five passenger trains, three within the city limits, have been standing without water or food. At 0350 on 18 July, terrorists drove up and fired on the trains with automatic guns. Fortunately, no one was hurt but there were more than 2,000 children and almost 1,300 women there. On 17 July, the railroad was damaged in three places. Repair teams are not at work. Internal forces soldiers are repairing track and protecting stations and highways.

According to the latest information from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press service, internal troops together with militia workers have seized around 300 weapons and dozens of kilograms of explosives and fire bombs. Since the conflict began, 18 people have died and 389 have been injured, including 30 militia workers and 7 internal forces servicemen. A worker of the State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration from Gudautskiy Rayon has been killed.

Vigorous measures are being taken to remove firearms from the population, explanatory work is continuing, and rumors are being countered.

During the night of 18 July, special regulations [osoboye polozheniye] on citizens' conduct were introduced.

There have been no casualties among vacationers.

Additional Rail Workers Deployed

LD2007135389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Workers on the Azerbaijan railway are searching for realistic opportunities to speed up the movement of passenger trains headed for Moscow, Tbilisi, Rostov, Yerevan, and other destinations and back via Baku, in connection with the events in Abkhaziya. Additional locomotive teams this morning worked to move the trains on the western and northern sections of the main line, a distance of over 600 km. From the very beginning of their shifts, they have been working to ensure that unscheduled daily passenger trains running in various directions are given priority treatment.

Economic Impact Assessed

PM2007123789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Dergachev report on statement by N. Kondratenko, chairman of Krasnodar Kray Soviet Executive Committee, in Krasnodar: "The Price of the Conflict"; date not given; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] For the 5th consecutive day, traffic on the railroad leading to Georgia and through Georgia (to the Transcaucasian republics) has been paralyzed—trains travel no further than Adler. All of Krasnodar Kray's major junctions, beginning with Kavkazskaya and ending with Adler, are jammed with trains.

Our correspondent, A. Dergachev, met with N. Kondratenko, chairman of Krasnodar Kray Soviet Executive Committee, and asked for his comment on the current situation.

"Every 24 hours, 25 trains travel in each direction through Krasnodar Kray to and from the Transcaucasus, of which 15 are passenger trains, 6 freight trains, and 4 electric trains. But for 5 days now traffic has been at a standstill: Not a single train has traveled further than Adler, and not a single car has come back. And this is happening at the height of summer vacation, when a mass of vacationers and thousands of children traveling to young pioneer camps are on their way to the Caucasian Black Sea coast.

"Emergency staffs were set up at once to perform two main tasks—to provide people with food and drink and, at the same time, to find ways to send each and every one of them to his destination. Whereas the staffs are coping relatively easily with the first task, the second has proved to be much more difficult. Some trains have had to be turned back, while in other cases passengers were sent on by either air or by sea. There is also the alternative of

routing trains to the Transcaucasus via a Baku detour. But this produced further complications—passengers of Armenian nationality flatly refuse to travel via Baku...

"And now about freight shipments. The tracks are blocked by more than 60 trains carrying petroleum, food supplies, and construction material for Armenia and other Transcaucasian republics. We cannot send sugar, vegetable oils, and grain to Georgia itself, and the Kuban is due to ship 50,000 tonnes of grain to its neighbors in August alone!

"You might well ask: What is the connection between events in Abkhaziya and grain harvesting in the Kuban? They are directly associated. Now that threshing is at its height, we need 700 freight cars every 24 hours to ship the Kuban's golden grain to other parts of the country, and yet we have virtually no freight cars. The harvesting conveyor belt has come to a halt—elevators are filled with grain, farms' threshing floors are overflowing with wheat, and there is nowhere to ship the grain. But the combines cannot halt. The ears of grain are falling and we might lose—literally in the fields—this year's grain harvest, which has proved to be one of the richest not only in the Kuban but throughout southern Russia.

"I realize that our good neighbors are experiencing misfortune, major misfortune. People from Abkhaziya with gunshot wounds are going to medical institutions as far away as Sochi. We feel sorry for people, but we all are paying too dear a price for the sorting out of interethnic relations while, on a purely economic plane, every fresh conflict makes our country poorer rather than richer."

Further on Unrest in Nagorno-Karabakh

Troops Withdraw From Stepanakert

NC2007143189 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] The inhabitants of Stepanakert in Nagorno-Karabakh Autnomous Oblast were startled to see that mechanized troop divisions were pulled out of city streets and squares this morning. The move is connected with the arrival of the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities.

Printers resumed work today after a 1 week strike. Today's 19 July issue of KHORHRDAYIN KARABAKH newspaper has been published. Local television broadcasts also resumed today.

Meeting Held in Stepanakert 18 Jul

NC2007140689 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] Tens of thousands of Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] people gathered at the victory square in Stepanakert last night. A sanctioned meeting was held in the square under the following slogan: to be prudent and circumspect, to frustrate the provocative actions of those elements who try in every way possible to abort the work of the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities.

Atajanyan, first secretary of the Stepanakert Party City Committee; Kocheryan, chairman of the Miatsum [unification] organization of the Armenian national [word indistinct]; Dadamyan, chairman of the Amaras charity organization and USSR people's deputy; [first name indistinct] Grigoryan and others addressed the meeting.

The meeting participants declared their unanimity and pledged to do everything possible to ensure the normal functioning of the commission. The meeting [word indistinct] the strike of the workers collective at the [name indistinct] printing house.

Tension 'Diffused'

NC2007132789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 19 Jul 89

[Text] Subunits of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry deployed in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] have to a certain extent diffused the tension of the last few days. However, individual [word indistinct] are continuing their provocative actions. The road communication between Stepanakert and its peripheries and with Armenia remain [word indistinct] (?interrupted). For unknown reasons, The Azerbaijanian Government has massed a great number of groups of Internal Affairs Ministry functionaries in the Azerbaijanized villages [word indistinct] the views of the NKAO Special Administration Committee.

The market of the oblast's capital is desolate despite the existing stock of meat and vegetables in the collectives. The main reason for this situation is the continued blockade of the roads. The bread, meat, dairy, and consumer services are functioning normally.

'Complex Situation' Reported

NC0607075189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] A complex situation continues to prevail in Stepanakert, which is the capital of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. As noted by Mikhail Gorbachev in his address on central television, the deterioration of interethnic relations is hurting the economy of the (?regions) and the entire country and causing serious material (?shortages).

The number of railway cars in the railway station in Stepanakert is increasing every day as work to unload them is being delayed. Aliyev, deputy director of the Stepanakert railway station, told our correspondent: It is impossible to describe the situation as satisfactory. Even though the pertinent organs are informed in good time, the railway cars, which arrive from various parts of the country, are unloaded very slowly. [passage indistinct]

Nor is the work at [words indistinct] satisfactory. A total of 37 containers loaded with raw material from [word indistinct], Andizhan, [words indistinct] for the shoe and tailoring factories have remained (?unloaded) for more than 1 month. As a result, the work schedule of the railway station's collective, the operations program of the railway cars, and the work rhythm of NKAO's [words indistinct] have been disrupted. [passage indistinct]

Situation 'Normal' Along Tajik-Kirgiz Border

LD2007151389 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1600 GMT 18 Jul 89

[Text] A curfew is in force for the 5th day in the three village soviets of Varukh, Charku, and Surkh following clashes on the borders of Tajikistan and Kirgizia. Long-standing disputes over water and land rights in a number of sections prompted the conflict.

As the rayon commandant and Tajik Socialist Soviet Republic [SSR] Minister of Internal Affairs Navdzhuvanov reported, at present the situation in the conflict area can be said to be normal. Subunits of internal troops and militia fully control the situaton. Isolated violations of the curfew have been recorded, but new incidents have not taken place.

The number of people who suffered among the Tajiks during the clashes and shooting of 13 July became clear. A total of 27 people are receiving treatment in hospitals; 19 of these were wounded by firearms. One of them, as reported, has died and doctors say another is gravely ill. Internal troops and militias who took part in restoring order also suffered in the course of the clashes: 66 were hurt and 1 military man is receiving treatment in hospital.

An emergency government commission is continuing its work in the conflict zone. Members of the commission meet the inhabitants every day. One such meeting took place on 17 July in the village of Oktvabre, where the clashes began. Attending the meeting were Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee; Khavevev, chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers; Vakhidov, first deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republican agro-industrial complex; Navdzhuvanov, internal affairs minister of the Tajik SSR; Mikhaylov, (procurator) of the republic; [name and title indistinct], and party and soviet leaders of Leninabad oblast and Isfara rayon. In the course of conversations with local inhabitants and on active search for a reasonable settlement of the issue, a number of measures were adopted making it possible to reduce the acuteness of the issue. The interrepublican Matchoi canal has been completely cleared of stones. A sufficient supply of water was restored to the [name indistinct] Kolkhoz in Batken rayon of the Kirgiz SSR. Talks are being held with the most authoritative residents on the precise establishment of borders and the rights to water and land in disputed sections. For this purpose, a commission has been established comprising members of governments from both republics. The work is continuing to completely normalize the situation.

Makhkamov first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, took part in a news conference in Isfara rayon and addressed journalists on the situation in a number of villages in the rayon, and on sources of and reasons for the conflict. Makhkamov also answered numerous questions from the journalists.

Novyy Uzen Curfew Reportedly To Be Lifted

LD0707131189 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Novyy Uzen, Kazakhstan July 7 TASS—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's televised address to the nation in which he called for maximum responsibility before this and succeeding generations in what concerns problems of inter-ethnic relations has evoked a positive response in Novvy Uzen, Kazakhstan's Guryev region.

The situation in this town and nearby settlements has normalised and curfew regulations are expected to be lifted soon.

All industrial and automobile transport enterprises, communal services and child-care centres are operating.

The town's leading enterprises have attained the previous level in production.

Crime rate has been reduced to the minimum. Explanatory work is being conducted at work collectives. The exodus of the Transcaucasian population from the town has stopped.

TASS Reports on 'Special' Militia Units

LD0607095289 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 5 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov:

Apprehending an armed and dangerous criminal, rescuing hostages, quelling large-scale riots and detaining extremists on the loose—all these risky operations were demonstrated today to Soviet journalists writing on legal affairs. The journalists visited a Moscow militia unit for special missions (the Russian abbreviation for which is "OMON"). The demonstration was organised for participants in an all-union seminar held by the USSR Interior Ministry and the board of the Union of Journalists of the USSR.

The force's chief task is to restore and protect public order during rallies and demonstrations. Regrettably, extremists sometimes use the democratic spirit of the meetings for staging provocations against the state and Soviet power and inciting ethnic strife. First, militiamen use loudspeakers for appeals to end the meeting. If the appeals are not heeded, the "OMON" force goes into action.

The following likely scenario is enacted: A group of "hooligans" is on the move, armed with sticks, stones, bottles and metal bars. A cordon of militiamen goes out to meet them, in white helmets with transparent visors, plastic shields and rubber truncheons. Sticks and other objects are being tossed at them. Bending low, the militiamen form one protective cordon with the shields and when the hurling of objects at them ends they swiftly rush forward. In a matter of seconds the hooligans are surrounded with the shields to find themselves encircled. Then militiamen in gray berets literally cut into the "crowd", breaking it into several groups and literally wrenching the "instigators" out of it. This is how "OMON" operates, for instance, during large-scale rioting.

The force was set up in the Moscow militia in October 1988. Since then it has gone into action over 600 times and detained about 2 thousand people. Before a militiaman who has been recruited by the "OMON" is allowed to participate in an operation, he has to go through over 1,000 hours of special training—which is greater by a large margin than the hours spent on training by an ordinary militia unit. Recruited into the special force are mostly people who have served in the army, with former air-borne troops enjoying preferential treatment. The average age of the men in the force, including the commanders, is 33 years.

During the whole time of the force's existence the main department of internal affairs of Moscow has not received a single complaint alleging bodily injuries inflicted during the force's operations.

TASS on Interior Ministry Special Division Force

LD0607225189 Moscow TASS in Engish
2038 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov:

It takes a soldier of the Dzerzhinskiy Special Motorised Rifle Division of the Interior Ministry forces exactly three minutes to cover a 250-metre obstacle course. Journalists who visited the unity today could get convinced of this. The journalists take part in an all-union seminar held by the USSR Interior Ministry and the Board of the USSR Union of Journalists.

Firing from a height of five metres, storming a building on fire with an armed "criminal" inside, a series of methods of hand-to-hand fighting, a jump into a tank with water on whose surface petrol is burning and then a jump (over a concrete wall, simultaneously throwing a knife—such are just some of the skills a soldier must have do cover the obstacle course. Then the soldiers made a quick march to a distance of 50 kilometres with a full service kit.

It is not in vain that soldiers of this division undergo such training. They can be alerted at once and in a matter of hours be operating in extreme conditions. Nagorno-Karabakh, Sumgait (Azerbaijan), Georgia, Uzbekistan, Novyy uzen (Kazakhstan)—these are the localities where soldiers from the special division operated during mass disturbances over the past 18 months.

"Youths not much older than 18, wearing bullet-proof vests and helmets, armed with rubber clubs, shields, submachineguns, tear gas oppose an incensed crowd, sometimes numbering thousands and instigated by extremists. Their duty is to protect citizens, their life, health, property. This is one of the main tasks of the special Division", Major-General Vitaliy Bosov, the division's commander, told TASS.

The journalists were shown plastic shields smashed by sharpened metallic rods, blood-stained bullet-proof vests: 109 soldiers of the division sustained injuries of various gravity during the events in Georgia. But they did not fire at the crowd as there were women and children in it. it is only six times that internal troops shot to hit, and then only during the events in Uzbekistan when they did not have any other way to check hooligans attacking patrols.

There is specialisation within the division: Some soldiers act most effectively during riot control, while others know ways of deactivating criminals, freeing hostages.

Petrovskiy Views World Ecological Cooperation

18070692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Jul 89 p 4

[Interview with V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, by M. Kozhukov: "One Planet for Everyone"; date, place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] **The ecology and politics: This was the subject of a recent meeting of the USSR Foreign Ministry [MFA] Collegium. At the request of IZVESTIYA special correspondent M. Kozhukov, USSR deputy foreign minister V.F. Petrovskiy talks about the involvement of the Soviet foreign policy administration in solving environmental problems.**

[Kozhukov] Vladimir Fedorovich, what explains your ministry's attention to ecological problems which, it would seem, lie outside the sphere of the MFA's direct interests?

[Petrovskiy] It would not be an exaggeration to say that today the ecology has become a "second front" in the struggle for mankind's survival. It is just as important as disarmament or the settlement of regional conflicts. Technical progress has gradually become a bane: The "Red Book" now contains not just individual species of animals, but the entire Earth... Mankind's environment is being rapidly degraded and the problem goes beyond the framework of state borders and can be resolved only through the efforts of the entire world community.

Today many people understand this. Judge for yourself: A top level meeting in France is planned on the problems of the biosphere. Czechoslovakia is speaking out in favor of a meeting of the leaders of the central European states. The ecology is one of the main items in the new "basket" in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue... In short, adoption of an optimal ecological strategy that includes the concept of and a program for joint actions by all countries is already becoming the demand of the day. And this is not surprising: We have only one atmosphere, only one world ocean for everyone, only one ozone layer for all. And an ecological disaster in one country inevitably affects neighboring states; remember Chernobyl....

So nature has become a subject of international policy and naturally falls "within the zone of responsibility" of our ministry. Incidentally, it is precisely in this field that questions of domestic and foreign policy have been tied in a tight knot. Without improvements in the ecological situation and without work on our own national program we shall not be able to participate fully in the international dialogue. On the other hand, international cooperation is the only way capable of extricating our country from ecological crisis.

[Kozhukov] What are the tasks that must be resolved in the immediate future?

[Petrovskiy] The question of priority importance is the USSR joining the international treaties and agreements already in force. The picture here is still an unhappy one. Of the 140 international nature conservation agreements registered in UNEP—the United Nations Environment Program—the USSR is signatory to only 54. For example, we do not participate in space monitoring of the condition of Earth, nor in the global data base for natural resources, with whose help it would be possible to prepare long-term predictions about the economic and ecological situations. The USSR does not participate in the Convention on the Protection of Migrating Animals.

The reasons for our nonparticipation are often narrow departmental ones. Someone is worried by some paranoid secrecy, someone else by the fear of control, which may show local authorities in a bad light. This departmental resistance is being overcome, although, it must be admitted, with difficulty.

There are, of course, weightier reasons. The assumption of international obligations should in some cases involve reconstruction of our enterprises, and this involves major financial costs. But as we see from, for example, experience gained in international cooperation to save Lake Baykal, it offers the opportunity of involving other countries in finding solutions to our ecological problems. Examples of this include our proposal to the FRG on joint research on general problems of the ecology of the Volga and the Rhine, and the creation of UNEP bases in the Karakum to study the problems of desert encroachment. The experts reckon that it could be extremely useful to devise an international program to improve the Aral region and the territories contaminated following the Chernobyl accident (the State Committee for Hydrometeorology is objecting to the letter, incidentally).

Joint projects also have another obvious advantage: Cooperation is advantageous for us from the standpoint of obtaining the latest technology.

[Kozhukov] About a year ago the socialist countries proposed the concept of ecological security, which is deemed to be an integral part of a comprehensive approach to international security. Is further work being done on this idea, and how has it been received by the world community?

[Petrovskiy] The concept of "International Ecological Security" is not to the liking of everyone in the West. They believe that the very term "politicizes" the problem. But in my opinion it is essential to start from the premise that the important thing is not formulas, that what is central is recognition of the priority nature of these tasks and of the need to resolve them together. And the essence of our proposals is that by insuring the security of the environment we secure ourselves and all mankind against "ecospasm" and catastrophe. On the path to this we will cooperate in the development of all states and in the creation of favorable living conditions for each people and for every person. Essentially it is a question of restoring the shattered health of the earth through joint efforts.

Our concept is being developed in cooperation with other countries and is gaining supporters. The idea has surfaced of setting up within the UN framework a unique "Ecological Security Council" and a center for emergency ecological assistance. This also testifies that the need to combine efforts in order to solve environmental problems is being keenly felt. It has also been proposed that an international space laboratory or manned orbital station be set up to be engaged exclusively in monitoring the status of nature.

The proposal advanced by M.S. Gorbachev in Strasbourg is a new step in developing the concept of creating a "clean house" in Europe. We hope that these proposals will be carefully studied by interested parties.

In general, however, attitudes toward the socialist countries' proposal to adopt a kind of mandatory "ecological code of behavior" are not showing any special objections. Although, of course, the dialogue that is developing will not proceed without difficulties.

Somehow or other, in accordance with a UN decision, in 1992 there is to be an international conference on the environment and development, possibly at summit level. So less than 3 years remain for us to devise a global strategy of nature conservation.

[Kozhukov] What, in your opinion, is required for international cooperation in this field to yield tangible results?

[Petrovskiy] It seems to me that the main thing is to be imbued with a sense of time urgency, which is where mankind finds itself, and with an understanding of the immediacy of the problems. We need a psychological shift, a new intellectual discontinuity. We need a mobilization of efforts by scientists and designers to develop new technologies that eliminate the destruction of nature and save us from a catastrophic warming of Earth. We need a complete model of consumption, first and foremost in the developed countries, that excludes the senseless waste of nonrenewable resources and enormous amounts of energy. And the world community must on an emergency basis adopt a plan of action to set up a system of collective ecological security.

New Leningrad Party Chief on Problems, Dialogue

LD2107100589 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Leningrad July 21 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Konstantinov: "We are ready for the most extensive constructive dialogue with all public movements," said Boris Gidaspov, head of the Leningrad regional committee of the Soviet Communist Party.

The situation is such that the energies of the party alone, the energies of popular fronts or other public organisations will not be enough to solve all problems that have piled up over decades. Integrated efforts and a common programme are needed.

TASS interviewed Gidaspov today, ten days after the plenum of the Leningrad party organisation elected him as its leader. The 56-year-old research chemist and a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, who heads the Soviet concern "Technokhim," replaced Yuriy Solovyev, an alternate member of the Politburo.

One cannot say that the change was unexpected: problems both in Leningrad's economy and the social sphere have become exceptionally acute. It was no coincidence that virtually all candidates from among party leaders and government senior executives suffered crushing defeat at the elections of people's deputies last spring.

Many areas—culture, education, public health, agriculture and industry are in the focus of my attention now, Gidaspov said. I have also to deal with problems faced by the Army, militia and the State Security Committee. Certainly, one may say that this is not the matter of the party regional committee. But if we regard ourselves as the leading force of our society, we should clearly formulate our views on the solution of the entire range of problems. "By the way, as for myself, I do not share the view that the party should totally distance itself from handling economic matters. We will deal with them but by methods of political leadership," Gidaspov stressed.

Responding to a question on relations with informal associations and groups, Gidaspov noted that "there are progressive forces in the city with which we are ready to conduct a constructive dialogue at any moment, and the opposition. This is totally different. These are not radicals, not supporters of transformations. This is an opposition which criticies without putting forward any alternatives. We know our drawbacks perfectly well ourselves, therefore we will argue with the opposition and argue heatedly. As for progressive forces, they are needed and we will conduct talk on equal terms with all," Gidaspov said.

Lithuania Adopts Law on Peasant Farms

LD0507084189 Moscow TASS in English 2014 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] Vilnius July 4 TASS—A session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet held on Tuesday adopted a law on peasant farms of the Soviet Republic of Lithuania. It defines economic, organisational and social conditions for the functioning of the restored and newly organised peasant farms and guarantees the right of Lithuanian citizens to manage farms on their own. The law envisages the giving of the land to peasants to be used gratis for an indefinite period of time. They will have the right to leave the land to their children. A peasant farm cannot have more than 50 hectares of farm lands. At harvest time peasants will be able to hire workers after signing a corresponding agreement.

The session also adopted a law on the restoration of Kaunas University named after Vitautas the Great. It was founded in 1922 and closed down in 1950.

Lithuanian Ministers Appointed

LD0607200889 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0000 5 Jul 89

[Summary] Following discussions at a session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet [date not specified], changes were introduced in the content of the Lithuanian Government. Kazimiera Prunskiene, doctor of economics, member of the Sajudis [Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring] Seimas Council, and USSR people's deputy, was voted as deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers. She will deal with issues related to Lithuania's economic independence, and to broadening economic ties with the West.

Marijonas Misiukonis, a former deputy minister in the Interior Ministry, was appointed as the new minister of internal affairs.

Old Names Restored to Vilnius Streets

LD0607130189 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] As of 1 July, Gediminas Square in Vilnius has been renamed to Katedros Square, Lenin Avenue to Gediminas Avenue, Red Army Avenue to Savanoriu Avenue.

The vilnius City Executive Committee has adopted a decision to restore old names to a number of streets and squares. We again have Barbora Radvilaite, Sventas Jonas, Kalvariju, and other streets. Dzerzhinskiy Bridge over the Neris River has been given its old name of Zaliasis Bridge.

This time, old names have been restored to more than 20 streets in Vilnius. Work in this direction is continuing.

Role of Restructuring in Moldavia Viewed

LD1807154189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0842 GMT 18 Jul 89

[Text] Kishinev, 18 Jul—TASS correspondent Dmitriy Chubashenko reports:

Mutual respect and consolidation of forces on the common platform of restructuring is the only rational way of solving the problems which have accumulated in Moldavia. This idea is coming to possess the consciousness of representatives of the various ethnic and social groups of Soviet Moldavia. It is penetrating the decisions of party and local soviet bodies; the appeals of working collectives; and the slogans of women's, veterans, and youth organizations. These documents are reaction to the sociopolitical situation which has taken shape in Moldavia.

The resolution just published by the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and government "on the events which occurred recently in Kishinev" acknowledges the situation to be complex. It denounces the extremist actions which took place in Kishinev: the calls by the Moldavian National Front at the end of June to not mark 28 June as the holiday of the reunification of the Moldavian people; the attempts by hooligans to mock the state flag of the Moldavian Republic; their breaking-up at the begining of July of a sanctioned meeting of the internationalist "Unity" [Yedinstvo] Movement....

The extremists' attempts to inflame the situation have provoked indignation among the inhabitants of Moldavia. At works, factories, and in associations, meetings of working collectives are being held at which calls are being heard for common sense, consolidation, for a constructive solution of social, economic, ethnic, and other problems.

Leaders of the republic are currently spending practically all their time at enterprises, meeting Moldavian town and rayon representatives. And the opinion of the overwhelming majority of citizens is united: all problems need to be solved, renouncing forcible pressure, on a democratic basis and in a spirit of attentiveness to one another.

Workers, intelligentsia, and youth are understanding ever more clearly the need for dialogue. About 30 youth organizations of various kinds recently united into the Republican Youth Forum. Its aim is the maintenance of stability and civil peace in the republic and assistance to restructuring. And representatives of the authorities are more and more often having meetings with leaders of spontaneous social formations who also agree that the accumulated problems can only be solved through consolidation and that extremism can only complicate the situation. At the town and rayon committees of the Communist Party of Moldavia discussion clubs are opening, which are designed to help the various social forces of the republic to find a common language and unite.

Faulty Design Caused Jonava Fertilizer Accident

LD1007172489 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 7 Jul 89

[Text] Once again we turn our minds back to the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet that took place this week. Today we'll speak about [words indistinct] issue discussed at the session, namely the causes and aftermath of the recent accident at the Jonava [word indistinct].

The causes of the accident were investigated by a commission of the All-Union Ministry of Mineral Fertilizers. The conclusions it came to are still unknown to Lithuanians, in spite of an [words indistinct]. Let me remind you here that the Jonava fertilizer plant is still within the jurisdiction of the All-Union Ministry. A chairman of the commission was invited to the session of the Lithuanian Parliament, but he did not find it necessary either to arrive or to explain his absence.

The causes and the circumstances of the accident in Jonava are being investigated by the Procurator's Office of Lithuania. The accident was also looked into by a commission of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, and we have informed you about its findings in our previous broadcasts. This time, however, the Lithuanian MP's discussed the facts provided by yet another commission, a commission set up by the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania and headed by academician Vitautas Statuliavicius, vicepresident of the Academy of Sciences of Lithuania. Other members of the commission made additional reports. It was clear that the commission did a very thorough research of the accident. The results of the research can be regarded as final.

The accident took place on 20th March at 11 o'clock [words indistinct]. Let's take a closer look at what really happened. The construction of the Jonava production association [word indistinct] had to be completed before the 25th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. The Lithuanian leaders wanted to report advance fulfilment of the plan. As a result, the fertilizers plant Janava now

carries the name of the 25th Congress of the CPSU. Such is the background of the construction of the plant.

Now let's speak about the explosion that took place at the isal- thermal [as heard] container of liquid ammonia. The design of the container is acknowledged to have been faulty. The huge double-walled container stands on a special ferro-concrete base and is fixed to it by the so-called anchor. Containers of this type made in Japan or the United States have twice or even three times [words indistinct]. The roof of the container was much stronger than its base and elementary logics say that in case of a very high pressure inside the container the roof will burst. Thus, the overflow of ammonia should be stopped by a round protective wall. The constant (?improvement) of the initial design left the protective wall only 40 centimeters think, instead of the necessary 110 centimeters. When the explosion took place the wall was demolished.

The most dramatic conclusion was made by Professor Antanas Kudris: The container was filled and emptied many times. The metal walls began to erode. The accident was inevitable. It should have happened after the 50th time of filling and emptying of the container with liquid ammonia, and so it did. After the explosion in the container 7,000 tons of liquid ammonia spilled. Aifre broke out which later on spread to the depository of nitro-phosphate fertilizer. Six people died during the explosion and one fireman was burned to death while putting out the fire. Substances that are very harmful for all living beings covered an area of 600 square km, according to official reports. The parliamentary commission says, however, that the hazardous area was much larger. The concentration of poisonous substances exceeded the accepted standards tens and hundreds of times. The forests that stand around the accident area lessened the impact of the explosion, but they suffered a loss themselves.

Information to the public was always late as measuring instruments and speedy radio communications lacked [as heard] at the site of the disaster. Even firemen did not have the necessary protective clothing and gas masks. All of them breathed in bigger or lesser amounts of poisonous gas and 140 were seriously injured. Thirty-seven thousand people were evacuated, though a lot more needed evacuation. Thousands of people remained in the poisoned area. First medical aid was proved to those who were injured, but it is still unknown if all were immobilzed, as is necessary in such cases. Without complete rest the poisoning can develop into serious disease with long-lasting consequences leading to disablement.

The parliamentary commission on the accident came to a unanimous conclusion. The rescue system was inefficent. Everything was done on improvisational grounds. Civil defence was severely criticized as well.

AIDS Center Established in Vilnius

LD0307170889 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 3 JUL 89

[Text] A newly set up center in Lithuania's capital Vilnius for preventing AIDS aims to promote broad education on the ground and organize a network of diagnostic services throughout the republic. Similar centers have been set up elsewhere in the Soviet Union. Although the number of AIDS cases in the Soviet Union is relatively small, the disease is said to be spreading rapidly.

Commission to Investigate '86 Kazakh Riots

LD1807153289 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 18 Jul 89

[Text] At the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet: As a result of deputies' inquiries and also appeals from citizens connected with the events which occurred in Alma-Ata on 17 and 18 December 1986, the Presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet has, with a view to giving this matter full glasnost, set up a commission for supplementary investigation into the circumstances of the affair. The commission is accommodated in government house, telephone 69-25-78. The results will be reported to the public of the Kazakh SSR.

Kazakh Figures Issue Appeal to Revive Language

LD1207123989 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 12 Jul 89

[Text] Alma Ata July 12 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Raisa Ioffe:

Representatives of professional and scientific circles of the Soviet Republic of Kazakhstan have issued an appeal to the population of the republic expressing concern over the future of the Kazakh language, the language of the nation whose name was given to the republic.

The authors of the appeal representing various nations expressed their respect for traditions of all the nations inhabiting Kazakhstan and stated with bitterness that the sphere of use of the Kazakh language was gradually shrinking. According to scientists, the Kazakh language is actively used today only in some spheres of public life.

Kazakh intellectuals believe that only official status for the Kazakh language can revive it. Along with it, Russian will continue to effectively perform its function of an instrument of communication among nations. Languages of other nationalities living in Kazakhstan will also be used and will develop freely. The appeal suggests a frank and sober discussion of this problem.

A number of measures for improving the teaching of languages, including Kazakh and Russian, were taken recently in Kazakhstan, whose population is made up of people of over 100 nations living in the USSR. The study of Kazakh and Russian on a purely voluntary basis was

introduced at pre-school child-care institutions and at all secondary schools from the 1st to 8th form. Intensive methods for teaching people of other nations the Russian and Kazakh languages are being worked out.

Latvia's Vagris Discusses Reform in Party, State

PM0507140989 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 20 Jun 89 p 2

[LATINFORM account of Latvian Television interview with Ya. Vagris by journalist Aldis Neymanis: "A Time for Intensive Work Rather Than Declarative Statements. The Opinion of Ya. Vagris, First Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee"—first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA introduction]

[Text] Yan Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, has taken part in the regular Latvian Television program "A Leader's Opinion." In conversation with journalist Aldis Neymanis many vital problems in the republic's socioeconomic and public and political life were touched upon. Television viewers' questions were answered. However, for various reasons, many of the republic's inhabitants were unable to watch the live broadcast. Therefore we publish an account of the broadcast which has been prepared by LATINFORM to acquaint the public at large with the highlights of this interview.

[Neymanis] Comrade Vagris, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which caused a stir throughout the country and that includes our republic, has only just ended. What lessons can we draw from the Congress proceedings with regard to solving problems in our republic?

[Vagris] There is much that we can learn both from the positive aspects of the Congress, and probably also from its negative ones. Above all, we can learn glasnost, since, as is known, all the Congress sittings, with the exception of two, were broadcast live on the second channel of Central Television and the "Mayak" radio station. A stenographic record of the Congress was published in IZVESTIYA. Thus the information provided could not have been more exhaustive.

The second aspect was total democracy. Those who followed the Congress proceedings no doubt noted that the most diverse opinions were expressed from the rostrum. There were some that were diametrically opposed, but even in these cases the leading organ of the Congress—the Presidium—did not try to silence anyone or pin labels on individual speakers.

So that it truly was a lesson in democracy, so to speak. You could say that this lesson went on a bit, and sometimes it might even have seemed that we were "kept after school." It is true that the hours were very long, and the Congress itself lasted longer than originally planned. As for the negative aspects, it is beyond question that we must deduce and bear in mind for future reference in our work that better preparation must go into events of this kind. In this case a mistake was made which must never be repeated. The preparation of the Congress was entrusted to the apparatus of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, while deputies and deputies' groups had almost no share in this preliminary work. If everything that ought to have been done had been done, then, obviously, the Congress proceedings would have been shorter, and there would have been more concrete proposals and results.

[Neymanis] So you could say that the Congress was democratic, yet its preparation was, to some extent, undemocratic.

[Vagris] This was a completely new venture, of course, but I agree with you that the Congress which was new in quality, was prepared largely by old methods. Here is another detail which we have learned—the time of issuing orders is out, the time of reasoned arguments is in.

[Neymanis] It is a time of struggle by political means, and I stress political, rather than administrative-bureaucratic methods.

[Vagris] A great deal more could be said about the Congress. However, of all the lessons which we were taught I would like to single out one issue which seems paramount to me. It is this. Serious thoughts are arising in respect of our future supreme organ of state power. As is known, a draft has been published in accordance with which a Congress of People's Deputies and a Supreme Soviet are envisaged in the republic. Now, quite sensibly, the opinion is taking shape that we should be asking ourselves: Does the republic need such a Congress and such a Supreme Soviet? Possibly, bearing in mind Latvia's scale, it would probably be enough to have a Supreme Soviet where a certain number of deputies would be working full-time in commissions. Maybe, we do not need a Congress at all? This is a debatable question. I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to ask the republic's population to join in more actively in the discussion of the draft law on elections. The draft has been published, but as far as I know, newspaper editorial offices have as yet received very few reactions and proposals. I must admit, I do not know what the situation is like in this respect in your case?

[Neymanis] It is true, we have not had many communications on this question either.

[Vagris] It is obvious that people's attention was absorbed by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. I would therefore again like to appeal to the inhabitants of the republic to actively express their opinion on the structure of our future supreme organ of state power, on how it should be formed, and how it should operate.

[Neymanis] I must come back to the Congress and Moscow once again. We have heard claims more than once, including from deputies, that in a certain sense it

was a victory of the minority, that the achievements were those of the minority. Do you also take the optimistic view that it was a victory of the minority.

[Vagris] Various terms were used—the victorious minority and the aggressive or dogmatic majority. It is possible to use all kinds of definitions, but you know, it is rather an arbitrary matter. You could ask me how I voted. With the aggressive majority or the victorious minority? I cannot state unequivocally that I sided with either the one or the other grouping. It all depended on what question was in the balance. Allow me to cite just two examples. When the question of the confirmation of officials in posts was being dealt with, I voted for Comrade Gorbachev's proposals, I voted for the candidacies which he put forward. Why? If we trust Comrade Gorbachev, we must allow him to put together his team. After all, he will have to work with these people. If he believes that a person whom he is putting forward will be of assistance, that he will be able to work with him, then we must trust his choice. Admittedly, I know many of these comrades, and I would have voted for them anyhow, but in some cases, when misgivings arose, I nonetheless relied on Comrade Gorbachev's judgment. This was because he, as chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, was putting forward his team.

[Neymanis] So in this case you sided with the dogmatic majority?....

[Vagris] Yes, you might say that I was on the side of that majority. I voted "in favor." It was a different matter during the vote on the establishment of the Constitutional Oversight Committee. Its status had not been worked out and it is uncertain even now. It is a completely new organ and it is not clear what its sphere of competence and its tasks will be. Therefore I voted against it. On this occasion I was with the minority. There probably was a certain section of deputies who always voted in favor of what the Presidium proposed. After all, this was only the first Congress. Many things have not yet been worked out and the deputies, as we were able to see for ourselves, were often unprepared. Instead of parliamentarism there were many elements reminiscent of a rally atmosphere. It was probably for this reason that the work dragged on.

[Neymanis] A question from a television viewer: "Do you expect an official apology for the accusation that has been leveled against Latvia of having sent somekind of assault detachments?"

[Vagris] In my view it is not up to the Congress but rather up to the deputy who made this accusation to apologize. We will wait and see. I know that representatives of our delegation spoke to the deputy during the break. But so far there has been no such apology, at least not at the Congress.

[Neymanis] It seems that there are no more questions concerning the Congress. You also mentioned elections in our republic. This issue is currently much debated. When will the elections take place? In fall or during the coming spring? What is your view of this question?

[Vagris] You see, we know that it was said at the 19th Party Conference that the elections to republic supreme soviets and local soviets should be held this fall. I will be expressing only my personal opinion on this score because the question has not yet been elaborated. We have not yet passed a law defining the shape of the future Supreme Soviet and the local soviets. Let me put it this way. Since we are trying to establish a rule-of-law state, we should follow the Constitution, we should keep to the terms defined in the Constitution. If we accept this, the term of office of the local soviets expires in December of the current year, and that of the Supreme Soviet in February of next year.

I, for instance, will propose that the elections be held within the terms laid down by the Constitution. You see, now when the elections are no longer a formal affair, when there is a great upsurge of political activeness, we must be realistic and try and work out how we can carry out this difficult task most efficiently. In the past it was easy. Supreme Soviet elections and local soviet elections were held at the same time and it made little difference whether you put two or three ballot papers into the box. Usually elections of people's judges were tagged onto the Supreme Soviet and local soviet elections.

It seems to me that in the current situation real elections will be held, there will be no more okrugs with a single candidate. In this context, a word about okrug campaign meetings. Most of us, most of the people who worked on the draft law, believe that they are not necessary, irrespective of how many candidates are running.

In these conditions it is not possible to combine the elections to the Supreme Soviet with the elections to the local soviets. They must be held separately. Incidentally, the Estonian comrades have already adopted a decision to this effect. I had some doubts in this respect to begin with—the sequence seems wrong, as it were. Since the USSR Supreme Soviet has been elected, it would appear appropriate to elect the republic Supreme Soviet next, and the local soviets later. However, if we follow the constitutional norms, the reverse order is indicated.

[Neymanis] Could you say a few words about social organizations in this context.

[Vagris] I believe quite unequivocally that the guaranteed representation of social organizations in the soviets is unnecessary. All candidates should be elected from territorial okrugs.

[Neymanis] There is great interest in the republic in preparations for the Central Committtee plenum and the

next Supreme Soviet session. What are the new tasks which are to be tackled at the plenum and the session?

[Vagris] First briefly about the Central Committee plenum. It is scheduled to take place at the end of July, on the eve of the session. I must say that during those 3 weeks which we spent in Moscow the preparations for the plenum did not progress very far. That is understandable. People wanted to know what was happening in Moscow and you cannot blame them for watching television and listening to the radio.

The main objective of the plenum will be to draw up a program of practical actions for the coming period for the Latvian Communist party as a whole rather than just the Central Committee. There is just over a year, or possibly 18 months, to go to the next congress. We must start thinking about preparations for the congress. So it is for this period that we are seeking to elaborate a program of concrete actions. Now about the session. The agenda is already known. I would just like to remind the television viewers that we are to examine a very important question at this session—we are to approve the republic economic accountability model and make the appropriate changes to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution and other legislative enactments.

[Neymanis] Could you give us a few more details about the republic party organization's program. Are any radical measures envisaged, such as for instance changes in the mutual relations with the CPSU? Are there plans to raise questions about the possibility of a multiparty system?

[Vagris] We will see. Various questions may be raised during the discussion at the plenum. Meanwhile I can tell you how we are getting ready. We are trying to learn from the experience which I mentioned earlier. I am referring to preparatory work being carried out by the apparatus alone. This time we have involved all members of the Central Committee, candidate members of the Central Committee, members of the Auditing Commission, and party rayon and city committee [raykom and gorkom] first secretaries who are not part of elective organs. And, it goes without saying, that the broad-based party aktiv is being involved in order to ensure a pluralism of opinions, in order to enable us somehow to generalize viewpoints, or at least try and generalize them since this is a relatively difficult task. But we must try. Hence all sorts of questions may arise spontaneously in the course of the plenum. After all, the former approach where read out a report or a draft resolution that had been prepared in advance, and you could be sure that they would be passed in the original form is no longer suitable today.

[Neymanis] Great changes in the composition of the Central Committee took place at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. Are changes in the lineup of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee also envisaged?

[Vagris] Yes. Already back in May, at the last Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, a number of comrades handed in their resignations. A number of applications are also to be considered at the next plenum. I believe that the plenum will comply with the requests of these comrades and we will have to proceed toward coopting new members. After all, none of the numerous party raykom and gorkom first secretaries are represented on the Central Committee. The question may, of course, arise here whether this is democratic or whether it is reminiscent of the old approaches on the lines of—if you are a first secretary, you must be on the Central Committee. I do not believe that this view should be taken today. People who have been democratically elected in their rayons, and what is more, elected from several candidates in many places, are needed for the benefit of the cause on the Central Committee too.

[Neymanis] Comrade Teteris is asking in this context (we have already touched upon this theme in passing): "Is there a chance of creating a multiparty system in Latvia at present?"

[Vagris] There are always chances. However, so far, at this very moment, I see no acute need to discuss the creation of a multiparty system. There are all sorts of movements in our republic, very diverse movements at that, but that is not yet the same as a multiparty system. The emphasis is on the word system.

[Neymanis] Comrade Kruminsh from Riga asks: "What view do you take of the demand for greater independence of the Latvian Communist Party as the republic party organization?" This refers to changes in federal relations, as it were. Are they necessary in your opinion?

[Vagris] I would not go as far as precisely defining the form of federal relations, but in principle this is a serious question. I had the opportunity to mention this issue at one of the May sessions of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to which I was invited for another purpose. If we are talking about the complete independence of the republic within the framework of the federation, the question of party building and party policy undoubtedly arises not just in theoretical but also in practical terms. What is the status of union republics and communist parties? It will have to be examined and formulated.

I do not think that it is necessary to introduce federal or other principles. It is simply necessary to give us independence in solving many questions, make it possible for us to decide many issues, to improve our competence. It is no secret, you only have to take a look at the Party Statutes, that the status of the Central Committee and party oblast committees [obkoms] is the same. So that there is a serious problem here whose solution brooks no delay, however the way of resolving it needs to be carefully looked into and discussed. One thing is clear—there can be no question of any kind of a split or separation.

[Neymanis] You mentioned the word separation. Lately it is constantly being used in the most varied meanings. Among other things also in connection with the appeal of the Latvian People's Front Duma of 31 May. What is your assessment of, and attitude to, this pronouncement? Many viewers have asked this question. I will name no names, but it is one of the most popular questions.

[Vagris] Clearly, this question is at the focus of public attention at the moment. Frankly speaking, we, and that includes me, learned about this appeal in Moscow. It came as a surprise and we were taken aback by the fact that such a sharp change of direction in the activities and program objectives of the People's Front could be made so suddenly and with such ease, not to say flippancy. We also discussed this question at a meeting of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau. We cannot endorse this concept. In general, a strange situation has emerged: The People's Front is nonetheless an important sociopolitical organization and putting forward a new slogan, it obviously ought to have submitted a corresponding concept substantiating the realism of this slogan and indicating how it corresponds to the interests of the people. However, the appeal merely contains the slogan calling for sovereignty outside the framework of the Soviet Union without providing it with an economic or political platform.

[Neymanis] So how is this to be implemented?

[Vagris] Quite. If you want to put something like that forward, you need a specific approach. In any event, the board of the People's Front which issued this appeal, and the Duma which endorsed it, must fully realize and accept their responsibility for possible consequences. In the conditions of the prevailing high political tension the consequences may be grave, and, as is obvious right now, such a step only adds to the tension.

[Neymanis] In this context viewers are asking: "Why is the question of Latvia's secession from the USSR discussed so much if this right is provided for in the Constitution?"

[Vagris] Doubtless no one is claiming that raising this question is unconstitutional, but people are guided by political realities. I believe that today any organization, especially if it claims the status of a sociopolitical organization, must be realistic as regards its activities and stance. It is an old truth that "All sorts of things are possible, but not everything is suitable!" This should not be forgotten, especially in the age of democratization and pluralism.

[Neymanis] In this context people are also asking about your attitude to the Movement for the National Independence of Latvia. Has it changed in comparison with the previous assessment expressed in the resolution of the Central Committee Bureau?

[Vagris] At present my attitude remains essentially unchanged. Why? Because a deputies' group was set up at the last session of the Supreme Soviet which was instructed to study the documents of this movement—after its extraordinary congress, that is—and to find out to what extent they accord with the Constitution and existing legislation. As far as I know, the commission has already prepared its conclusion and submitted it to the Supreme Soviet Presidium which is yet to examine it and adopt a decision. The attitude to this movement will undoubtedly be formulated on the basis of the conclusions of the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

[Neymanis] Many viewers are asking whether the status of party member is compatible with the expression and backing of an idea such as sovereignty outside the USSR statehood?

[Vagris] Outside the USSR? Yes. There is a problem here and I believe that this is precisely a case where we must not wait, as in the old days, for instructions from above, for what the Central Committee may decree. First of all, in this case, every Communist must himself decide what's what. If he sees this as the only way to formulate the question of the republic's sovereignty, then he himself must decide whether there is a place for him in the Communist Party.

[Neymanis] Comrades Grasis and Puzure are interested in your view on citizenship.

[Vagris] There must be republican citizenship. A law on citizenship is being elaborated and when the draft reaches the stage where it can be discussed, it will be published and submitted for nationwide discussion. Incidentally, one of the questions which will be elaborated by the new USSR Supreme Soviet concerns citizenship—USSR and union republic citizenship. Other questions are also arising here, for instance about autonomous republic citizenship. Back at the Congress autonomous republics have already raised their voice demanding that the status of autonomy be clarified and given a specific content, rather than being a mere declaration.

[Neymanis] Let us return to party life. There is the following question: "How, in your opinion, is the implementation of the decisions of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee January Plenum on the mass media progressing?"

[Vagris] This question is too general. Not everything has been done, not everything is cause for satisfaction, and, unquestionably, a great deal remains to be done. For instance, the resolution stated that republic political and economic leaders should regularly give briefings in the mass media, including on television. This is the second time that I have been in your studio since this resolution was adopted, and my colleagues have also played a much more active part in television discussions. Consequently, viewed from this angle, the resolution is being implemented. However, this is not the only, nor even the most important aspect, of course. Much work lies ahead of us.

[Neymanis] However, reading between the lines of this question, I sense a certain interest in what the Central Committee is doing to control and oversee the work of the press, radio, and television. There is a slight hint of nostalgia for old times, don't you think?

[Vagris] I said at the beginning of this interview that the Congress has shown—and we all have to bear this in mind—that the times of handing out orders are a matter of the past. There must be dialogue, discussion, and reasoning. But there must also be discipline. Many deputies expressed concern in their speeches to the effect that in questions of discipline—in the broad sense of the word—we have made no progress. I believe that discipline, organization, and a sense of responsibility—a statesmanlike approach, as it were, are essential.

[Neymanis] Our time is running out, just a few more questions, please. "Your attitude to the second Congress of the Interfront?"

[Vagris] I find it relatively difficult to define my attitude because, for some incomprehensible reason, especially after the lesson of total openness furnished by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Interfront congress took place almost in conditions of secrecy. We do have some information, but it is incomplete. Judging by this information, nothing especially new has been added to the positions of the Interfront, there have been no radical changes. The Interfront leadership still tends to talk a lot about the need for dialogue, consolidation, recognition of the leading role of the party, and assistance to the party in the implementation of its tasks, yet at the same time the Interfront leadership is trying to foist on the leadership of the republic solely and exclusively its own opinion and to exert overt political and economic pressure. I have once described such actions as blackmail, and maybe I will repeat this word again in connection with the second congress because appeals for strike action and for the establishment of strike committees remain on the agenda. Incidentally, we were criticized for setting up some kind of "assault" detachments at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and we took offense. However, as you know, the establishment of somekind of defense groups at enterprises was discussed at the Interfront congress. So it may turn out that there is no smoke without a fire. In Moscow we wanted an apology, but now we have to think about what is happening on our own doorstep. I would not like to claim, of course, that some kind of "assault" detachments are in the making, however, in an atmosphere of secrecy it is impossible to find out what is meant and what and whom these groups are to defend. Incidentally, the Central Committee has a precise opinion also on the subject of the calls to convene an extraordinary congress of the Latvian Communist Party. We have also discussed this question 19 May together with party committee first secretaries from all cities and rayons. And they all said unequivocally that an extraordinary congress of the Latvian Communist Party is not necessary.

[Neymanis] According to unofficial information it appears that this demand was also put forward at the second congress of the Interfront?

[Vagris] Yes, according to unofficial information this demand is contained in the Interfront documents. I believe that what we need with regard to this question now is a cool head. We must not prematurely succumb to emotions. When we get the documents, we will be able to discuss this concretely, although it is incomprehensible why we should have to wait a whole month.

[Neymanis] The demand to convene an extraordinary congress obviously means heading toward a split in the party.

[Vagris] Without any doubt. Essentially it would also mean brushing aside all concrete matters connected with the advancement of restructuring. After all, we need to make very serious efforts to prepare for the switch to economic accountability as from 1 January. This is no slogan, this is a specific, immensely complex task. But if people insist on a congress, we will have to put all this aside and devote ourselves totally to the congress. Ultimately, this will substantially affect not only party organizations but society as a whole. And without any doubt, in the atmosphere that prevails today, each side will seek to send its most radical forces as delegates, and there will be no question of consolidation in the congress hall as such, there will be a certain split in the Latvian Communist Party and the Congress will put its seal on it.

[Neymanis] Will this not practically halt restructuring work?

[Vagris] Yes, I believe that this is what will happen.

[Neymanis] We have talked for an hour, although 50 minutes were allocated. The most vital questions, even if not all of them, have been answered. Thank you for the interview.

Estonian Gosplan Head on Congress, IME

PM2007123189 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 16 Jun 89 p 3

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy R. Otsason, first deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Estonian State Planning Committee, by correspondent Ya. Tolstikov, carried under the rubric "Deputy's Forum": "A Step Forward Has Been Taken"—no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] USSR People's Deputy R. Otsason, first deputy chairman of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Minister and chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee, replies to questions from our correspondent Ya. Tolstikov.

[Tolstikov] First of all, could you please describe the overall atmosphere prevailing at the Congress of People's Deputies. How democratically were its sittings conducted? Of course, many people followed the progress of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet sittings on radio and television, but personal impressions from an eyewitness of events are certainly the most vivid and most truthful.

[Otsason] Compared with yesterday and the day before yesterday, a major step forward has been taken as regards the democratization of the country's social life. And the Congress graphically demonstrated this. There were bold and frank speeches, constant clashes of opinions, votes against particular proposals and candidacies. Such boldness was not felt even at the 19th party conference.

Nonetheless, I think that this was only the first step. Genuine democracy was still in short supply at the Congress and at the chambers' sittings. The larger part of the audience obeyed the presidium's will, the will of whoever chaired a given sitting, be it M.S. Gorbachev, A.I. Lukyanov, or anyone else. This did not always benefit the common cause. Let us recall, for example, the dramatic unfolding of events when the question of the Constitutional Oversight Committee was being discussed. The majority of deputies, obeying the presidium's will, were ready to vote (and had already voted!) to create such a committee. But what could have been the possible outcome? A committee comprising some 15-20—if I am not mistaken—people would have started imposing its will on union republic Supreme Soviets which had adopted various amendments to the constitution. This is undemocratic. There is no logic in it. And so, while the voting was taking place, the majority of Lithuanian deputies rose from their seats and, as a sign of protest, walked out of the hall. Their example was followed by many deputies from Latvia and Estonia. Myself included.

The next day, as you might recall, there was no longer any question of creating the Constitutional Oversight Committee. M.S. Gorbachev announced that it had been proposed to set up a commission to elaborate a draft Law on the Constitutional Oversight Committee. It appears that the walkout by Lithuanians and some other deputies played a positive role, and I am convinced that we acted correctly. The question was fairly resolved.

There were also quite a few other flaws, deviations from procedural rules, and breaches of the principles of democratism. In my view, it was incorrect that the elections of Supreme Soviet chairman and Council of Ministers chairman—despite protests by many deputies—were held before M.S. Gorbachev and N.I. Ryzhkov delivered their reports. Do you recall Yu. Afanasyev's objection on this account? An aggressively obedient majority. Unfortunately, it gained the upper hand only too often.

Procedural rules were frequently not observed. For example, 3 deputies from each union republic should have been given the floor for 15 minutes each to speak on the reports. Moreover, according to procedural rules, the delegation itself should have named its speakers. It is well known that I. Toome and K. Khallik spoke on the first report for Estonia. I. Gryazin was to have been the third speaker. But his turn simply never came. I was scheduled to speak for Estonia in the debate on N.I. Ryzhkov's report. But neither I nor any other delegate from Estonia (Deputy G. Golubkov, director of Azeriskiy ceramic plant, was also scheduled to speak) was given the floor. Our delegation proposed that the question of economic accountability be discussed under "Any Other Business." But it was not included on the agenda. This whole part of the sitting was cut short at the Congress.

[Tolstikov] Yes, many people in the republic who were following the development of events at the Congress certainly noticed this. But here we have what is perhaps the main question: deputies' attitude toward the concept of republican economic accountability submitted to the Congress by Lithuania and Estonia. What was their attitude at the start of the Congress and at the end?

[Otsason] I must say that, on the whole, attitudes toward our proposals were positive. We, as provided by the procedural rules, distributed among delegates all the relevant documents adopted at the last session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, including the draft USSR Law "On the Transition of the Estonian SSR to Republican Economic Accountability" (as of January 1990). Our concept was backed in speeches by deputies from Kazakhstan, Georgia, Belorussia, a number of autonomous republics within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and Krasnoyarsk Kray. It can be said that the idea of republican (regional) economic accountability has captivated people's minds in many of the country's regions. As the Congress went on, attitudes toward economic accountability really changed for the better. These are, of course, pleasing facts. The draft Congress resolution contained instructions to the Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers to look into Lithuania's and Estonia's initiative. It is planned to form an appropriate commission. It will include Estonian delegates Comrades Ryuytel, Savisaar, Golubkov, and Otsason.

[Tolstikov] At the end of his speech V. Yarovoy announced that a group of deputies would distribute at the Congress a document entitled "The Concept of Republican Economic Accountability and the Future of the Russian-Speaking Population in Estonia" and handed it over to the presidium. Who is the author of this document?

[Otsason] According to procedural rules, any document can be distributed at the Congress at the request of 20 or more deputies. The aforementioned document was properly printed on good quality paper. At the end of the document, it said that it was being distributed at the

request of USSR People's deputies Comrades Kogan, Lyzo, Yarovoy (deputies from the Estonian SSR), Blokhin, Vasilyev (a total of 31 signatures). Procedural rules were thus observed. As to the author of this document, he is unknown. The document is essentially anonymous. It has hardly played and is hardly likely to play any positive role in explaining the essence of the question of republican economic accountability. It will rather obstruct its fair solution. As a matter of fact, there is no need to attach any great importance either to V. Yarovoy's speech at the Congress or to the document distributed by him and his supporters. This is simply an annoying episode and nothing more.

In my view, V. Yarovoy and Ye. Kogan adopted an incorrect stance during our delegation's meeting with M.S. Gorbachev in trying to prove by all possible means that the the concept of Estonian self-management [IME] does not fit within the present USSR Constitution. But we have no intention of concealing this. The draft USSR Law on the Transition of the Estonian SSR to Republican Economic Accountability directly indicates which articles of the USSR Constitution should, by way of an exception, no longer apply to the Estonian SSR to enable it to fully ensure its transition to republican economic accountability. It is perfectly clear that the new must without fail do away with everything that is obsolete and hinders our advance (even if this applies to the fundamental law), otherwise there can be no progress. This is axiomatic. Moreover, we ought not to forget that, at the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet's May session, deputies (including Russian-speaking deputies) voted virtually unanimously, with only one deputy abstaining, in favor of the republic's transition to economic accountability.

[Tolstikov] Did the Congress discuss in any form the question of a republic's own currency when it switches to economic accountability?

[Otsason] No, officially it was not discussed. But the Congress was not held only in the hall, there were also debates in the lobbies. We were given to understand that a number of the country's economists support our idea about republican currency. Nor is this idea any longer rejected at top official level.

[Tolstikov] Some SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA readers, judging by their letters, are of the opinion that the Estonian SSR Law on the Republic's Transition to Economic Accountability is more of a political rather than an economic document. What could you say in this context?

[Otsason] That this is a totally wrong view. It is true that the law does contain political elements like, for example, the question of the republic's sovereignty. But this is inevitable and necessary because, unless it has sovereignty, the republic will be to all intents and purposes unable to implement the IME concept. This must be made absolutely clear.

[Tolstikov] The Congress draft resolution does speak about republican and regional economic accountability. But what will happen if deputies ultimately reject Lithuania's and Estonia's proposals? Will we then start applying the "Maslyukov Plan," in other words the all-union plan for the transition of republics and regions to cost recoupment and self-financing?

[Otsason] No, under no circumstances. We will still aim to implement our own concept, which is more radical and more effective, at any rate as far as Estonia is concerned.

[Tolstikov] As a matter of fact, what is the mechanism for the introduction of IME? Is everything necessary being done in our republic?

[Otsason] Even while the Congress was at work, the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers set up working groups to elaborate the relevant normative acts, specifically regarding the budget system in IME conditions, money circulation, banks and the credit system, foreign economic ties, and others. Matters are thus moving forward. The deadline for preparation of the normative acts is the 3d and 4th quarters of 1989.

[Tolstikov] Famous economists like G. Popov and N. Shmelev spoke at the Congress. How do you appraise their speeches?

[Otsason] They filled the gaps which unfortunately existed in N.I. Ryzhkov's report. And the report virtually failed to reflect the numerous proposals by economists regarding the radical perestroyka of the country's economy which were made during the pre-Congress debate. True enough, a Committee for Economic Reform was set up, but for some reason G. Popov and N. Shmelev are not on it, the committee is not headed by a scientist like P. Bunich (who is a member of the committee), which would have been logical, but by a production man. Really a halfhearted measure.

[Tolstikov] And finally, what is your overall appraisal of the Congress?

[Otsason] As I already said, a great step forward has been taken. But it is just one step, even though the Congress could have taken three and even five steps forward during the almost 3 weeks of its sittings.

[Tolstikov] What, in your view, prevented this?

[Otsason] The general shortage of democracy in the country. The Soviet Union has, to all intents and purposes, never lived in conditions of genuine democracy. We are only now beginning to think about this. And yet democracy has to be learned, this process takes decades. Democracy must become part of the flesh and blood of man, of all members of society. Only then will genuine people's power become possible. Look at the way the Congress deputies were elected in our country. Just a

single candidate was registered in approximately 900 electoral okrugs. What sort of elections are these? In approximately 900 other okrugs candidates were weeded out according to the principle of loyalty to the apparatus by the okrug commissions themselves (it is well known that we refused to do this in our republic). And what was the outcome? An okrug might have 30,000 or more voters, but the question of candidates was decided at okrug meetings attended by only 500 people. This is clearly undemocratic. All this was reflected in the composition of delegates—the majority were, unfortunately, obedient to the will of the Congress presidium and rarely expressed their own independent point of view, which was reflected in the voting results on various questions. Nonetheless, I would like to say that the Congress as whole will certainly have a favorable effect on society's life. A step forward has been taken, and it must be followed by new and more decisive steps.

Medvedev Meets Estonian Scientists in Tallinn

LD0607125189 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 6 Jul 89

[Text] Tallinn July 6 TASS—Chief Soviet ideologist and Politburo member Vadim Medvedev met Estonian scientists in Tallinn on Wednesday.

Among the issues discussed were the slow progress to full-cost accounting in the republic and the need for both a republican and central mechanism for its introduction. Medvedev said that the model of full-cost accounting proposed by the Estonian Government is now being studied with great attention in Moscow.

Special attention was paid to the discussion of the development of the republics' sovereignty and the regulation of international relations, including linguistic problems and migration. The scientists expressed their wish for more details concerning the 1939 Soviet-German pact and historical events connected with it.

The participants of the meeting unanimously stressed the need for more independence in the work of the republican academies of sciences, the right to determine the main directions of their research and structures of their scientific institutions.

The discussions continued during a meeting with workers, specialists and leaders of a plywood and furniture plant in Tallinn. Medvedev visited the departments of the plant and spoke to workers about their working conditions and salaries.

Medvedev also met representatives of the union of the Estonian working collectives and soldiers of the Tallinn garrison on Wednesday evening.

Medvedev laid a wreath near the eternal flame of the memorial of fighters for Soviet power.

Problems in Armenian Aid Distribution Detailed

NC0807102289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 8 Jul 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] During its regular session, the Armenian Council of Ministers discussed serious shortcomings in the unloading, inventory, and distribution of the material assistance sent from abroad for earthquake relief. The Armenian Republic's committee of people's control, the Interior Ministry, Procuracy, and Finance Ministry [words indistinct] have uncovered serious shortcomings regarding the unloading and immediate distribution of freight to the victims.

A press release has been issued on this by the press center of the Council of Ministers.

Turkish Delegation Visits Baku 3 Jul

NC0607080189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 4 Jul 89

[Text] A Turkish Government delegation arrived in Baku on 3 July, led by Minister of Finance and Customs Ekrem Pakdemirli, who is also the head of the Turkish delegation at the Turkish-Soviet committee for economic cooperation. Volkan Vural, Turkey's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary in the Soviet Union, and responsible workers of the Ministries of Trade and Foreign Affairs in Turkey arrived in Baku together with Ekrem Pakdemirli. Nazliyev, chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations Main Administration for Economic Relations with Asian Countries [title as heard], accompanied the delegation.

Asanov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, met the guests at the airport. Mutalibov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, received the members of the Turkish delegation. The guests visited the Azerbaijan History Museum, acquainted themselves with athe architectural aspect of the inner city, and familiarized themselves with sites of interest in Baku.

The delegation left for Moscow on 4 July.

Udmurtiya Supreme Soviet Opposes Factory Construction

LD0507153689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 5 Jul 89

[Text] Perhaps for the first time in the history of the Supreme Soviet of Udmurtiya, a most eloquent document has been adopted. At a routine session, the deputies of the highest body of state power of the autonomous republic unanimously voted to reject the construction of one of the new enterprises of the Yelaburskiy Vehicle Works in Izhevsk. The deputies proceeded from the position that the republic does not possess the construction capacity for the erection of the project, costing R100

million. In addition, dozens of industrial enterprises already operate in Izhevsk. A fairly tense ecological situation has arisen in the capital of the republic. The principled decision by the deputies has received widespread support from the workers of the republic.

Academician Warns of Carpathian Pollution

LD1007105189 Moscow TASS in English 1028 GMT 10 Jul 89

[Text] Kiev July 10 TASS—The reputation of the Ukrainian Carpathians as one of the most unpolluted Soviet regions has recently been seriously shaken, Academician Yaroslav Podstrigach, head of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences' western scientific centre, told TASS.

According to Podstvigach, the main threat to the region is unbalanced economic development. During the last ten years the total volume of output has grown by 160 per cent here higher than average in the republic. There are now many chemical enterprises near the Carpathians and the annual level of air pollution here is about a million tonnes of harmful substances. The water pollution level is about 40 million cubic meters of sewage with such a huge chemical concentration that to dilute it to normal conditions the total local river flow is necessary. But the bureaucrats don't worry: They plan to build a number of new chemical enterprises.

The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences' western scientific centre and Soviets of people's deputies of the local regions have developed a republican programme "the Ukrainian Carpathians". The programme aims to improve the economic structure, reduce and strictly regulate the construction of new industrial facilities and encourage the development of small ecologically pure plants.

"It is unreal to demand that all enterprises be taken away." Academician Podstrigach said. "But it is absolutely necessary to demand the conversion or even the closure of the most ecologically harmful factories. We should speak about total industrial improvement with the help of modern technology, the improvement of the territorial economic structure and a choice of regional development priorities. The work is difficult but necessary".

Drugs Dealers Jailed in Uzbekistan

LD0407085389 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 3 Jul 89

[Text] Law enforcement bodies in Uzbekistan have denounced a group of criminals who engaged in drug manufacturing and selling. Twenty-one persons were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. During the investigation it had been established the criminals disposed of 5 tonnes of cannabis and 20 kilograms of raw opium. When arrested they had surrendered 19 kilos of opium, 50 kilos of other narcotic plants, and also an (?impressive) amount of money and jewellery.

New Weekly Published for Crimean Tatars

LD1307062789 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 13 Jul 89

[Text] Simferopol July 13 TASS—Crimean Tatars now have a weekly in their language, a supplement to the Simferopol-based newspaper KRYMSKAYA PRAVDA, entitled DOSTLUK (FRIENDSHIP).

The new publication's name was directly reflected in the contents of its first issue, which featured stories about how members of different nationalities work together for the good of all.

The next few issues will carry features on Crimean Tatar history, essays by linguists and articles by those campaigning to protect the Crimean environment.

DOSTLUK is now on sale in news kiosks in the Kherson and Krasnodar regions and Uzbekistan as well as in the Crimea.

Religious Monthly Published in Ukrainian

LD1807142889 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2100 GMT 16 Jul 89

[Summary] A new religious publication has appeared in the Ukraine. It is a monthly paper called KHRYSTYYANSKE ZHYTTYA [Christian Life] published by the Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists of Ukraine. The first issue of this paper, published in Ukrainian, has come out in Kiev. The paper will illustrate the life of believers in the republic, foster the unity among Christians, and teach the reader to be a conscious citizen of the country.

Economic

Collegium Supports Railways Minister

18290221 Moscow GUDOK in Russian 11 Jul 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "The Branch Needs Help and Support"]

[Text] On 6 July in the Ministry of Railways there was an expanded meeting of the Ministry of Railways collegium with the participation of the chiefs of railroads on which the state of affairs regarding the fulfillment of assignments for prompt shipment of fuel and other national economic cargo was rated as critical. Immediate measures were earmarked for strengthening discipline in the utilization of the rolling stock, above all flatcars and tank cars, acceleration of the delivery of cars to the loading areas, and strengthening of the interaction with the enterprises and organizations for prompt and rhythmic unloading of cars. Special attention was devoted to increasing the safety of the movement of trains and improving the service for passengers. Concrete deadlines and responsible people were assigned for implementing the aforementioned measures, which will provide for making up for lost time in shipments.

At the meeting of the collegium they discussed the results of the consideration at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the candidacy of N.S. Konarev for the position of USSR minister of railways.

The shortcomings in the work of rail transportation noted in the speeches of a number of deputies actually do exist and the collegium will do everything it can to eliminate them as quickly as possible.

At the same time it was emphasized at the collegium that solving problems such as improving the quality of passenger transportation, accelerating the delivery of cargoes and protecting them, and improving the social and domestic conditions for workers of the branch depend not only on the branch itself but also on the capabilities of the national economy as a whole and above all those related to the delivery of passenger and cargo cars, locomotives, rails, ties, track vehicles, spare parts, construction materials and mechanisms, and the allotment of the necessary capital investments.

It was noted at the collegium meeting that the responsibility for solving the problems that have accumulated in the branch over several decades cannot be placed on N.S. Konarev alone.

On 7 July at a meeting of representatives of the labor collectives of the railroads and transportation enterprises and organizations in which more than 250 people participated the discussion of the state of affairs in the branch continued.

The speakers sharply criticized the position of the supply ministries who chronically fail to deliver the planned volumes of rolling stock, materials, and equipment to rail transportation.

As a result of the frank, businesslike exchange of opinions, the meeting noted that with the appointment of N.S. Konarev to the position of minister even in the first months of 1983 significant positive steps were taken in the activity of rail transportation and a decisive course toward improvement of the social conditions for the labor and life of railroad workers and improvement of their material well-being was adopted.

As a result, 1983 became a turning point in the work of the branch. While before that rail transportation regularly failed to fulfill planned assignments, in 1983 and all the subsequent years the plans for transportation of passengers and national economic cargo were overfulfilled. During this period the volume of cargo shipments increased by 13.5 percent and passenger transportation by 16 percent.

Large-scale organizational and technical measures were conducted which made it possible to sharply increase labor productivity and increase wages for railroad workers using the railroads' own money. Especially appreciable changes took place in housing construction, where volumes increased by 25 percent as compared to the preceding five-year plan.

The branch was among the first to change over to the new management system, which made it possible to considerably strengthen its financial position. Structural changes were made in the branch management and the ministry's central apparatus was reduced by more than one-third.

But the branch continues to have many unsolved problems which are causing justified criticism against the railroad workers. In addition to objective factors such as the critical shortage of rolling stock, especially passenger cars, rails, ties, and track equipment, this situation is also caused by the existence of their own shortcomings, above all in the service for passengers and safety of travel.

In order to eliminate them and raise the level and improve the quality of the growing amount of transportation, a concrete program of measures has been developed and is being implemented.

Participants in the meeting were unanimous in their evaluation of the activity of N.S. Konarev and in the idea that his replacement during a responsible work period would have a negative effect on the processes of restructuring in rail transportation.

Participants in the meeting sent a request to the USSR Supreme Soviet to reconsider the question of assigning N.S. Konarev to the position of USSR minister of railways.

Participating in the meeting were the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, L.A. Voronin, and members of the Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers for Transportation, Communications, and Information Science.

Report on First United Co-Ops Congress

18270120 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 5 Jul 89 p 2

[Report by L. Pertsevaya from Moscow: "Arguments Generate...."]

[Text] **It must be the case that the Hall of Columns in the House of Unions in all its history has never seen such heightened passions and emotions, such heated debates, as it has during these 2 days of work of the All-Union Congress of United Cooperatives of the USSR in the Sphere of Production and Services. Several times the chairmen (and they changed) declared a forced recess not stipulated by the regulations so that the delegates would have an opportunity in debates in the corridors to define their positions, exchange their opinions, and formulate what they want. There was nothing unnatural in this: The cooperators are only beginning to be aware of their**

sociopolitical power, they are just learning to think collectively. The personalities who gathered there, frankly, are exceptional, each of them an entrepreneur with a clearly expressed character, ambition, and pride, which has been bruised more than once in the struggle for existence. This could not but determine the explosive and nerve-racking course of the congress.

They debated procedural issues for a long time, ardently insisted on equal rights for republic and branch associations, disputed decisions first of the mandate, then of the editorial commission... And still, in spite of all the exertion, the expenditures of nerves and time, this was a truly democratic congress. Although the threats of individual groupings to abandon the congress took one's breath away, although it seemed that the hall, shot through with contradictions and arguments, would split apart, and the birth of the union of cooperatives would not take place—all difficulties were overcome. The regulations were basically reworked and adopted, changes were made in the list of the union's basic directions and tasks, a structure was adopted for the management organs, and problems of representation in them were solved. In other words, the association which the cooperators desired and at the same time feared was actually created, and one should be gladdened by the results of the congress if for no other reason than that.

I shall allow myself a brief digression regarding this "fear." During the course of the preparation for this congress many expressed serious fears that a kind of governmental apparatus would be created for controlling the cooperative movement and that the initiative and creativity of the lower levels would be squeezed in grips of regulating ukases and decrees, that this centralized organ would not protect the interests of the cooperators. The lack of faith in the good intentions of the assistants and consultants from the government was reinforced by recently published documents concerning taxation and restriction of the sphere of activity of the cooperatives. But at the congress itself representatives of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers displayed the greatest tact and courtesy, and the democratic nature of the meetings was never once violated or infringed upon. I think that the cooperators themselves also defended their right to free expression of their will: through strict consistency of their positions, a clear awareness of the vital importance of the decisions that were being made, and the ability to reach a compromise in difficult situations.

This ability was needed more than once.

The first clash of opinions took place during the discussion on taxation. Just before the congress the presidiums of the republic supreme soviets adopted ukases, in many of which, in the opinion of the cooperators, the percentage rates exceed all reasonable limits. The cooperators' first reaction was to protest and demand that the right to set taxes be returned to the center. But many representatives of cooperators from the Baltic republics were unable to support this demand since it contradicts the idea of regional economic accountability. In their local areas they had resolved questions of taxation to their mutual satisfaction. How could they avoid disagreements here?

Delegates of the congress still made an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet to invalidate the ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 23 February 1989. Practically everyone supported this appeal. And only a couple of delegates from Latvia gave a special statement to the press, in which they supported the country's cooperators in their struggle for their rights but at the same time emphasized their agreement with the idea of regional economic accountability.

Delegates from Uzbekistan, incidentally, discussed at the congress how they were able to defend their positions in their own republic and there was no need for them to go back on their word and take the rights away from the republic supreme soviet and return them to the central agencies. They were convinced of this not only by the meeting but by economic calculations. Special force was attached to the conclusion that with the draconian taxation capital would begin to flow out of the banks of Uzbekistan, for example, into the banks of Estonia. After that a reasonable compromise which satisfied both sides was found. Perhaps this is the truest path in the dialog of the sides?

Delegates to the first congress also had a thorough debate regarding representation in the union of united cooperatives. Who may enter this union—republic associations, branch, interregional associations? And if republic ones can, what about alternative associations which have already declared their right to representation on the spur of the moment, like the union from Kazakhstan? The congress, having made a fair amount of noise, granted the union only the right to a voice but no vote, thus denying the possibility for other alternative associations which might arise in any republic to a full-fledged existence. Interregional associations have been firmly denied the right to representation. And the branch associations which, as a rule, are created in our country under central organs like the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], Gosstroy [State Construction Committee], and the Bureau of the USSR Council of Ministers for Machine Building are essentially purely commercial formations and have been given the right to representation in the newly organized union. The congress, unfortunately, did not adopt any resolution to stipulate its relationship to all "other" associations; it simply placed them "outside the law." And so this in itself usurped the right to appeal to all state organs on behalf of the cooperators and took it upon itself to control the cooperative movement single-handedly.

But we shall not be in a hurry to accuse the congress of an undemocratic decision; rather it did not manage to think through fully the entire extremely complicated situation.

In the immense flow of problems and situations of conflict it was not easy to separate out the most important and develop a correct position during the course of stormy debates. Time will help the cooperators to make corrections if they are given the opportunity.

In general many important decisions have been adopted (or rejected) spontaneously by the delegates during these two days; the creativity was of an improvisational nature. Thus, for example, in one fell swoop they voted for the proposal of A. Fedorov, the chairman of the city association of cooperators of Moscow: to consider the main task of the newly organized union to be the struggle of the cooperatives for their rights by all methods permitted by the USSR Constitution and to achieve recognition of the equal rights of the state, kolkhoz [collective farm], and cooperative forms of ownership. Logically developing this idea, they decided to fight for the abolition of all coefficients in the acquisition of equipment, means of transportation, and raw material. Not bad! But just as easily, without thinking, they rejected all the proposals of the delegates from the Baltic states concerning taking minority opinion into account. And this is a shame.

The congress also defended the right to a democratic formation of the management organ: The nomination, discussion, and voting for candidates for the council of the Union of United Cooperatives and the presidium of the council will take place in the presence of all delegates and candidates for president will speak from the podium and familiarize the delegates with their program. Incidentally, nine of them were nominated and all were heard with rapt attention. Unanimously, with a storm of applause VASKhNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I. Lenin] Academician V. Tikhonov was elected to the post of president (and the congress adopted an amendment to the constitution to the effect that the council should be headed by the president himself and not a chairman). Just as unanimously and enthusiastically all the delegates elected A. Tarasov and Yu. Vorontsov as vice presidents. They are now forming a work group for implementing congress decisions.

...The USSR State Committee for Statistics reports that there are now about 100,000 cooperatives operating in our country, joining together about 2 million people. The volume of product sales last year amounted to more than 6 billion rubles and in the first quarter of this year they have already reached more than 4 billion. You will agree that the growth rates are simply overwhelming. But even these data from official statistics, in my view, while registering the dynamics of the cooperative movement, do not reveal its true capabilities. In many of the speeches of congress delegates these potential possibilities were described clearly and convincingly. I shall refer to only a couple of examples from Bashkiria.

In Ufa the Svet cooperative one year had 12 million rubles in circulation; in its shops it produces complicated instrument fittings for state enterprises and consumer goods; and 98 percent of its products are sold at state rates. And in the village of Zingereyevo the Rodnik cooperative purchased a run-down farm. There are half as many workers there now as there were before but impressive transformations have taken place. For the first time in many years the arable land has been thoroughly cultivated and rich fields have been plowed. The cooperators are convinced that the grain harvest here will be not 8 quintals per hectare but 30. The confidence of the new farmers is not coming out of a void. The milk yield per cow on the farm has already increased from 4 liters to 14. The farm is being built up, it is being outfitted with equipment, and the people are satisfied. But the cooperative chairman, A. Surnadzhan, concludes his speech with pain and indignation: "A good farmer does not slaughter a milk cow. But they are trying as hard as they can to destroy us, to suffocate us with taxes, coefficients, and decrees. What kind of a battle is this, or are we not Soviet people in the Soviet country, are we not working for the good of the society?"

Indeed, it is time for the society to recognize the kind of productive force we are failing to allow to develop fully. Thanks to the association the cooperators have been given a voice. We shall hope that by working together they will be able to solve the most pressing problems: social insurance and protection from rackets, equal access to the foreign market, and the opportunity to acquire raw materials and equipment at the same prices as the state on the domestic market. Incidentally, we shall discuss the problems in greater detail in the next issue of KOOPERATOR, in our supplement. And we shall close with the hope that the cooperative movement will develop and grow strong and that healthy forces and tendencies toward consolidation and democratization will gain special predominance in it.

A.P. Biryukov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, participated in the work of the congress.

Agricultural

Bureaucratic Barriers to Leasing Deplored

PM1907151989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jul 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Leaseholders and Administrators. What Is Hindering the Development of New Economic Relations in the Countryside"]

[Text] Harvest time is here. It has one peculiarity: The barrage of commands from offices has died down. Many grain growers have felt that they are finally getting genuine independence and becoming masters of the land, saying farewell once and for all to the unenviable role of day laborer. In both the grain and the feed fields work is going well this year, in most places better than

last year. This is yet more convincing testimony to the uselessness of the "prodders" and edict-mongers who thought that the peasant would not be be able to take a single step without them.

Many dogmas and stereotypes are now a thing of the past with the advent of leasing to the countryside. A genuine sense of stewardship, interest aroused in the results of labor, tangible incentives—these are what are reviving the countryside in those places where lease relations are developing informally. However, some people are trying to pass off as leasing certain individual elements of economic accountability. Just for the record, they say, so we are no worse than others in this regard. There is no benefit from this kind of "assimilation" of the new method, and the damage is considerable. Shelves will not be fuller because of leasing which exists only "on paper." You would think everyone would understand! But it turns out that there are some who do not. Indeed, there are many who saw the important work as merely a routine campaign.

No, this is not a fashion, nor an innovation introduced at someone's behest. Many leaseholders have seen for themselves how much a person can do when he stops being a hired hand and performer of another's will. The leaseholders of the "Zavorovo" State Farm [sovkhoz] near Moscow, which was one of the first cooperative associations in the country, have sensed, for example, the advantages of the cost-cutting mechanism. Here N. Prokhorikhin, the farm director, was the heart and soul of restructuring and the most vigorous propagandist of lease relations.

Unfortunately, practice also provides examples which are the very opposite. "I. Khantlyev, a martyr-leaseholder from 'Rossiya' Collective Farm [kolkhoz] in Yakovlevskiy Rayon, Belgorod Oblast, is writing to you. I think that it is not only on our farm that leasing is faring badly. Office bureaucrats have given it a hostile reception." There follows a bitter confession of the torments to which the machine operator condemned himself by concluding a contract with the kolkhoz. Spokes were put in the family link's wheel at every step. The result was a sorry one. When the leaseholders, having gathered a poor harvest of tubers, tried to keep them for seed, the militia came to confiscate the potatoes. The matter even reached the courts.

Leaseholders frequently make serious complaints about administrators. Of course, there are among leaders and specialists many supporters of the new forms of labor organization. But there are also many who create all kinds of obstacles for economically accountable teams and links. Some fall prey to ambition, others do not want to share power with the leaseholders, and yet others see them as virtually a threat to socialism. Of course, such actions and sentiments can be explained partly by relapses into the administrative-bureaucratic system, which has still not laid down its arms. But it seems that some leaders have not understood that the extensive development of lease relations is a most important part of the party's new agrarian policy. And whatever specious excuses they use to interfere in leaseholders' work, objectively they are harming restructuring.

There is no room for fuss and haste in a new venture. No one today needs successful reports on the successes in the "introduction of leasing." But if people are willing to operate in the new way, then they should not be prevented from doing so. Nonetheless, administrators look for an excuse to refuse people the right to work in the new way. They say that it is sufficient to introduce the checkbook system and contracts, and there is no need to adopt leasing. However, life has shown convincingly that only lease relations and cooperatives ensure true economic accountability in present conditions. And chiefly in those places where economically accountable income belongs to the peasant. But often, as before, the office disposes of it. Hence the frequent conflicts over remuneration. There was an angry letter from O. Amangeldiyeva from "Moskva" Kolkhoz in Mary Oblast about breaches of contract. Some administrators are at pains to make sure that people don't get too wealthy. But there can only be one criterion here—not to pay money that has not been earned.

Is it only high earnings which primarily attract rural workers to leasing? Management freedom is frequently the main incentive. But it is precisely the newfound farmers who frequently do not get it. Sometimes the office monitors each step taken by the leaseholder. Excessive tutelage, as a rule, is counterproductive: The person is never allowed to feel the full degree of responsibility for the final result. Or sometimes the following happens. The contract states that the link can dispose of above-plan output. But some zealous administrator aims to deprive leaseholders of this right on the absurd pretext that too much meat, grain, or potatoes will be left with the collective. So people lose output which legitimately belongs to them, and along with this they lose faith in the changes and in leasing's great potential.

Many legal and practical questions were solved when the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On Leasing and Lease Relations in the USSR" was issued. Henceforth the game will no longer be one-sided. Until recently the leaseholder essentially had to pay not only for his own blunders, but also for the administration's unfair actions. Now the responsibility for compliance with the contract is reciprocal. The state guarantees that there will be no "dekulakization" or return to day labor. At the same time some readers, particularly those who have already been "burned" by being refused a parcel of land, believe that the future Law on Leasing should envisage a different procedure for allotting land. The local soviets, many people think, must have full charge of it.

Establishing new economic relations in the countryside is no easy matter and cannot be done overnight. But the leader who sees leasing only as a means of boosting labor

productivity and increasing the manufacture of foodstuffs is being shortsighted. Small cooperatives, lease collectives, and individual peasant farms are reviving the countryside and restoring it to a meaningful life. So teams and links working in the new way cannot do without social assistance.

Frequently when leaseholders fail to find a common language with the director or chairman, they ask for protection from the rayon agro-industrial association and party and soviet organs. The administrator who has overstepped the mark, so to speak, is put in his place. But conflicts would not arise at all if rayon and oblast leaders took a more vigorous stance in adopting leasing. Not a wait-and-see stance, but a principled and uncompromising one. So that the bureaucratic urge cannot stifle initiative and enterprise.

The summer's hard work is soon over. This is probably because people, carried away by their work, do not notice how time flies. Especially as the rural workers have countless concerns today. May they not be prevented from taking genuine charge.

Scientific

'Cosmos-2032' Satellite Launched 20 Jul

LD2107071689 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 21 Jul 89

[Text] Moscow July 21 TASS—The Soviet Union launched the Cosmos-2032 artificial satellite with space exploration equipment on board on Thursday. The satellite was taken into orbit by the Soyuz rocket booster.

The satellite's orbit has the following parameters:
—the initial period of revolution—88.8 minutes
—the maximum distance from the earth's surface—275 kilometers
—the minimum distance from the earth's surface—193 kilometers
—the orbit's inclination—82.3 degrees.

The satellite also carries a radio system for accurate measurement of the orbit's elements and a radiotelemetric system to send information on the work of instruments and scientific equipment to earth.

All the equipment is functioning normally.

Semipalitinsk Region Radiation Discussed

LD2007135689 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 20 Jul 89

[Text] Alma-Ata July 20 TASS—By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Vodolazov and Raisa Ioffe:

A workshop which ended in Semipalatinsk today, discussed a set of questions pertaining to the health of population and the ecological situation in Semipalatinsk region of Kazakhstan where a nuclear testing ground has been operating for three decades. Its participants—Soviet scholars, environmentalists and representatives of public organisations—examined the results of work done by an intersectoral expert commission which studied the ecological situation in the area of the testing site for a month at the demand of the public.

Mark Orlov, head of a laboratory of the scientific and production amalgamation Taifun in the city of Obninsk, central Russia, said in the commission's report that the radiation situation in the area of the testing site was normal in May 1989 when the expert group worked there. Experts examined samples of water, soil, fodder grass and milk for the content of radioactive metals and made measurements of air for gamma radiation. All results were within permissible norms.

Experts detected at the same time that the level of soil alpha-background was somewhat higher at a depth of down to 10 cm in two districts of Semipalatinsk region. This is evidence of 30-40-year old sediments which had been caused by nuclear arms tests in the atmosphere.

Much attention was given to detecting malignant tumours. A thorough analysis showed that atmospheric nuclear tests have definite consequences. In 1970 the oncological sickness incidence in the region was 30 per cent higher than the national level and 70 per cent higher in 1988. The level of allergic and chronic infectious diseases is high.

Workshop participants concurred in the following opinion: A moratorium on nuclear testing is needed. But this largely depends on the situation with nuclear tests abroad, above all at the American testing ground in Nevada.

The workshop prepared specific proposals concerning the complicated situation in the area of the Semipalatinsk testing ground. A decision was taken to publish a bulletin on the radiological situation in the region, to install dosimeters for public use and to establish a regional immunological centre.

Military

Embassy Official in Ankara Cited on New Soviet Ship

NC2107081789 Istanbul HURRIYET in Turkish 18 Jul 89 pp 3, 14

[Aziz Utkan report: "The Soviet 'Mystery Ship,' an Antisubmarine Vessel"]

[Excerpts] Ankara (HURRIYET)—HURRIYET has removed the mystery surrounding the "super warship" the Soviet Union secretly began building in the Black Sea in 1985. In a statement to HURRIYET, Valter Shonia, under secretary at the USSR Embassy in Ankara, for the first time confirmed the existence of the "mystery ship," which has been built in the Black Sea and named "Tbilisi." Recalling unfounded reports in the Western countries in connection with the Soviet Union's super

warship, Shonia said that the new ship is a little larger than "Kiev" class aircraft carriers and that it has been built to be used in antisubmarine warfare.

Shonia said: "First of all, the name of the ship is 'Tbilisi,' not 'Kremlin.'" He added that the "super warship," which was launched by the Nikolayev dockyard in the Black Sea in 1985 and the existence of which has been denied to the Western world since the time it was launched, is definitely not an aircraft carrier. He disclosed that the "Tbilisi" is a naval ship designed for "antisubmarine warfare," which can also accommodate helicopters and aircraft.

Valter Shonia asserted that he had no information as to when the ship will cross through the Dardanelles. He added that they will contact the Turkish Government in that regard when the time comes. [passage omitted]

Larger Than 'Kiev'

Valter Shonia, who is the embassy official with the greatest authority after Ambassador Albert Chernyshev, said that "Tbilisi's" hull was larger than that of the 273-meter-long "Kiev," a 37,100-ton guided missile and vertical takeoff aircraft carrier which crossed through the Dardanelles some time ago. The Soviet diplomat asserted that the "Tbilisi" was built as a multipurpose defense ship, as was the "Kiev." He added that the new ship was designed as an "antisubmarine" vessel.

Replying to a question on whether aircraft can land on the new ship, which, according to Western intelligence organizations, is 300 meters long and weighs 65,000 tons, Shonia said: "The ship is not an aircraft carrier."

The Soviet diplomat said that he had no information as to when the new ship will cross through the Dardanelles. He asserted, however,that the crossing may take place during the next few years. Shonia noted: "The ship is not an aircraft carrier in the full sense of the word. It has platforms on which helicopters can land and carries equipment for antisubmarine warfare. The ship is designed as an antisubmarine vessel."

Shonia also noted that the ship had a platform for vertical takeoff aircraft. On reports about the passage of the "Tbilisi" through the Dardanelles, he said:

"In view of its structure, we do not believe that the "Tbilisi's" passage through the Dardanelles will create a problem. Actualy, it is only the Turkish press that claims that a problem exists in that regard." [passage omitted]

Admiral Explains Reasons for Scrap Ship Auctions
PM2007112989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with Admiral V. Sidorov, deputy commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, by N. Sautin under the rubric "News Panorama": "Destroyer Under the Hammer; USSR Navy Opens Auction To Sell Off Warships for Foreign Currency"—date and place unspecified]

[Text] "Seventeen Soviet submarines and one cruiser have already been sold to the Norwegian firm 'Fram Shipping Bermudes' [name as published]," Admiral V. Sidorov, deputy commander in chief of the Soviet Navy, said. "We received good money for the cruiser. The firm payed around $2 million. The submarines went at $140-150,000 apiece. 'Sudoeksport,' through which the sales are being carried out, is receiving telegrams from dozens of countries proposing to make deals. Our ships and vessels are in demand in Turkey, Yugoslavia, Austria, the FRG, China, Sweden, Spain... I would like to reassure readers right away that the ships we are offering abroad are suitable only as scrap metal. This is what the foreign buyers want. At today's prices, 1 tonne goes for something in the region of $180."

[Sautin] But does the Soviet Union not need this scrap metal? Or could the ships perhaps be converted into training bases or made available to the maritime fleet, fishermen, or scientists...?

[Sidorov] The Ministry of the Fish Industry and the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet have themselves sold off their old ships for some time now, and at considerable profit. We, on the other hand, for security reasons have kept our ships in secluded inlets once they have been written off, until they can no longer stay afloat and simply sink to the bottom. I can tell you in confidence that a group of our specialists has drawn up a chart of these sunken ships. There are about 500 of them resting on the seabed along our shores, also counting, of course, those which sank during the years of combat operations, starting with the civil war.

The cruiser sold for 2 million was built back in the fifties and the submarines even earlier. "Sudoeksport" can now offer interested firms more than 100 ships and auxiliary vessels from the naval fleet for international auction. Keeping them laid up is to our loss.

We ourselves cannot make economical use of this metal, although our need of scrap metal is no less than anyone else's. Why? Because our country does not have enough powerful, modern, specialized ship-breaking yards. There are plans for their construction but they have yet to be commissioned!

It is not possible to convert ships which have outlived their service life to meet research needs: The life of the metal from which they are made is already exhausted. Before sale, we do, of course, remove from the ships all electronic equipment, instruments containing nonferrous and valuable metals, and armaments—in short, everything that is still useful or which constitutes a military or technical secret of the Navy.

[Sautin] Does the Navy plan to surrender scrap metal to the State Trust for the Procurement and Processing of Secondary Ferrous Metals?

[Sidorov] Of course. More than 100,000 tonnes per year. But the State Trust cannot promptly assimilate even this planned quantity of metal: The standard of technical

equipment at its bases is low and there are constant problems with the provision of rolling stock to transport the scrap metal...

Incidentally, we are prepared to cooperate not only with foreign firms but also with Soviet institutions and cooperatives. We have something to offer them. All that clients have to have is highly productive metal-cutting equipment.

[Sautin] Did you yourselves come up with the idea of becoming traders or was it suggested from another quarter?

[Sidorov] In 1982 the Soviet Union signed an international convention which stipulates that the coastline must be free of all pollutants by the 1990s. But hundreds of ships and other vessels are rusting in our bays and along our shores. The idea of selling them for convertible currency on the international market arose 2 years ago. The USSR Council of Ministers instructed the Soviet Navy to prepare destroyers, cruisers, minesweepers, patrol ships, and submarines that had been written off for sale abroad.

[Sautin] What proportion of the foreign currency generated by these auctions is used to meet the needs of naval personnel?

[Sidorov] About 10 percent. It only just covers the expenditure on preparing the ships for sale. The Maritime Fleet and the Ministry of the Fish Industry are left with 5 times as much foreign currency... But we are satisfied with this, because we see trade as the only solution at present to the problem of getting rid of extremely worn-out ships. Add to this the funds needed to keep personnel on these ships, which have been out of action for a long time, with no prospect of action in the future.

In present-day conditions, reliable defense can only be ensured by the very latest ships and auxiliary vessels. This new form of cooperation with foreign countries gives the fleet an incentive to more rapidly rearm with effective defense systems.

Public Inspection Official on Arms Cuts

PM2007111489 London MORNING STAR in English 20 Jul 89 p 4

[Interview with Soviet Public Inspection Group Deputy Chairman Dr Sergey Rogov by Sergey Sidorov, correspondent of the Soviet Army daily KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: "Glasnost And Arms Cuts"; date and place not given—first five paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] A Public Inspection Group was set up in the Soviet Union last April at the initiative of several non-governmental organisations to monitor cuts in the Soviet armed forces.

Among its members are scientists, cultural personalities, military commanders, experts in international relations and disarmament and representatives of trade unions, the Soviet Peace Fund and other non-governmental organisations.

Many of them are People's Deputies, members of the new Soviet parliament.

Aleksander Kokoshin, corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and deputy chairman of the Soviet Scientists' Committee for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat was elected chairman of the group.

The following is an interview given at the request of the Novosti Press Agency to the correspondent of the Soviet army daily Krasnaya Zvezda, Sergey Sidorov, by Dr Sergey Rogov, deputy chairman of the new public inspection group.

[Sidorov] Why was the Public Inspection Group set up?

[Rogov] Its creation reflected the growing public contribution to democratisation and glasnost, especially in the field of defence, security and disarmament.

Our aim is to make this contribution even more effective and to assist in every possible way the implementation of the policy of reasonable sufficiency in defence.

[Sidorov] What are the specific tasks of the group?

[Rogov] First is the strengthening of ties between the army and the public.

There must be no ground for rumour and speculation here.

With the policy of greater openness, or glasnost, we must establish broad contacts with representatives of the armed forces, because defence and security are the matters that concern all of us.

Our second objective arises from the planned reduction of the Soviet armed forces, announced by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Soviet Union is reducing its troops and armaments on a unilateral basis, so the reduction does not envisage international control.

There is no need for excessive secrecy.

Greater openness on our part will prove in practice the defensive orientation of the Soviet military doctrine.

The public must know how these reductions are made and our group hopes to obtain information, which it will pass on to the public in the Soviet Union and abroad.

Members of the group will conduct on-site inspection of withdrawal and disbandment of Soviet contingents and redevelopment or destruction of military hardware.

The measures taken by the USSR are the beginning of real progress toward general disarmament.

We believe that it is particularly important now to study their social and economic implications.

People who honestly did their duty in the name of their country will be released from the armed forces.

According to the data provided by the general staff, there are nearly 100,000 officers among them.

The public must know how these people will be employed, retrained and provided with housing.

Another major objective is to maintain contacts with public representatives in other countries.

So, the group has asked the general staff for permission to invite foreign public leaders and MPs [Members of Parliament] to participate at their choice in monitoring the reduction of the Soviet armed forces on the territory of the USSR.

The general staff has gained such permission.

[Sidorov] With what has the group begun its work and what are its plans for the future?

[Rogov] On their first mission, representatives of the group travelled to the GDR to see units and formations which are to return to the USSR.

From May 15 to 23 the group watched the withdrawal of a Soviet tank division from Mongolia.

Later our representatives made a new trip to the GDR to observe the pullout of the 25th and 32nd tank divisions to the Soviet Union.

Next on our schedule is the inspection trip to Czechoslovakia, where representatives of the group will watch a Soviet morotised rifle division adopt a new defensive structure.

And then on to Hungary to monitor withdrawal of the 13th tank division to the Soviet Union.

We are grateful to the general staff and Soviet military commanders for the assistance they have given us.

On the basis of the information that we shall ask for from the general staff and our random inspections, we shall issue a statement confirming the withdrawal of the above-mentioned forces in accordance with the decree of the USSR Ssupreme Soviet Presidium "On the Reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces and Defence Expenditures in 1989-90.

Later we shall make on-site inspection trips to see how these units are disbanded and monitor the transfer of their armaments and other military hardware to depots, and their conversion to civilian use.

The group will also regularly sum up the data on the reduction supplied by the general staff.

We are planning to invite specialists to study questions relating to verification and other issues involved in force reductions.

Their findings will be made public and submitted to the Supreme Soviet (parliament) commissions in charge of foreign policy and defence.

Statute on Officers' Meetings To Be Implemented

PM2007130589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "News, Events, Comments": "Symbol of Democratism"]

[Text] The interim statute on officers' meetings in the Armed Forces comes into force 1 August.

By order of the USSR defense minister the procedure for work on creating a new social organization in units, establishments, military educational institutions, and garrisons has been defined.

During August-September this year it is proposed, in particular, to hold instructive studies and seminars on organizing the meetings' work. In cooperation with the command, with political organs, and with party, All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, and trade union organizations they are designed to enhance the activeness and responsibility of the officer corps for the fulfillment of their military duty and to raise the prestige and authority of the Soviet officer's rank. Every officers' meeting must devote special attention to the strengthening of military discipline and the prevention of abuses of official position and manifestations of arrogance, conceit, rudeness, red tape, and other negative phenomena in Army and Navy life.

Before 1 October 1991 it is proposed to generalize the work experience of officers' meetings and to submit proposals for preparing a permanent statute on officers' meetings in the USSR Armed Forces through the USSR Ministry of Defense Main Cadres Directorate.

The order to introduce the interim statute and also this statute itself are being circulated to separate companies,

rayon military commissariats, military educational institutions, scientific research institutes, military construction detachments, military missions, and military departments of civilian higher educational institutions.

The collective which prepared this statute and the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial board thank all who sent in their suggestions and comments on improving the draft statute on officers' meetings.

Chief Investigator Discusses MiG Crash Inquiry

PM2107084589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondents V. Antonov and B. Moskvichev report: "Thorough Expert Analysis Needed"]

[Text] Brussels—"At present it is not possible to draw final conclusions on the reasons for the unfortunate incident involving our MiG-23M, which crashed on Belgian territory after a long, pilotless flight," Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Rusanov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry aviation flight safety service, stated in conversation with your IZVESTIYA correspondents. (He was heading the group of Soviet experts in Belgium to investigate the causes of the accident). "Nevertheless, after joint work with Belgian specialists we can firmly state that on 4 July an emergency situation really did occur over a military airfield in Poland. The MiG pilot, Airman First Class N. Skuridin, acted correctly and did everything necessary in a complex and critical situation."

At the beginning of the joint work, the Soviet experts' leader continued, our relations with the Belgian authorities were guarded. We encountered a quite lengthy procedure of coordinating various questions, and sometimes the Belgian side's demands seemed far-fetched. Until as late as 10 July we were unable to visit the scene of the accident. But gradually the atmosphere began to change for the better. The main reason for this improvement was the complete frankness of the Soviet side, which gave the Belgian authorities the full information at our experts' disposal. We visited and inspected the scene of the accident.

"Then there was the joint decoding of the black box film which had already been developed by the Belgians. After a long and thorough study of the results of the decoding together with the Belgians the necessary verdicts were given to the Belgian military prosecutor, who agreed with our joint verdict that the Soviet airman was not culpable.

"But for a definitive investigation into why the aircraft continued to fly after the pilot had ejected we needed to obtain the remains of the MiG-23M. Incidentally, the Belgian specialists were extremely interested in the operation of our planes' automatic flight systems. On 14 July the Soviet experts were allowed to inspect the aircraft's remains. Afterward agreement was obtained to send them to the USSR for comprehensive analysis. At the moment we do not know what happened, and it will take long and intensive work to determine precisely what did happen. There was also an agreement that all the results of the expert analysis will be presented to the Belgian side.

"During the joint work with the Belgian specialists and the numerous meetings at ministries and departments, both sides became increasingly convinced of the need for a clear and frank exchange of information so as to avoid misunderstanding and mistrust. And we are glad that the necessary contact has been achieved. The incident involving our aircraft must serve as an impetus to the examination of the important question of elaborating measures to prevent such incidents in the future and creating a notification mechanism between the two military blocs," Ye. Rusanov said in conclusion.

Leaders Sign General Altunin's Obituary

PM2107084389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jul 89 Second Edition p 6

[Obituary of Army General Aleksandr Terentyevich Altunin]

[Excerpts] On 15 July 1989 Army General Aleksandr Terentyevich Altunin, eminent Soviet military commander and Hero of the Soviet Union, died after a serious illness.

A loyal son of the Soviet people and an active participant in the Great Patriotic War who devoted his entire adult life to the selfless service of his people, the socialist motherland, and the cause of the Communist Party, of which he had been a member since 1943, has departed this life.

A.T. Altunin was born on 14 August 1921 to a peasant family in the village of Steklyanka in Kalachinskiy Ravon, Omsk Oblast. [Passage omitted]

He was commander of a combined unit, a large strategic formation, and the North Caucasus Military District. He held senior positions on the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, was chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Cadres Administration, chief of USSR civil defense, USSR deputy defense minister, and latterly a military inspector and adviser to the USSR Defense Ministry Group of General Inspectors. [Passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, P.G. Lushev, K.A. Kochetov, A.D. Lizichev, A.S. Pavlov, Yu.P. Maksimov, V.I. Varennikov, I.M. Tretyak, A.N. Yefimov, V.N. Chernavin, A.N. Soshnikov, M.I. Sorokin, V.M. Arkhipov, V.M. Shabanov, N.V. Chekov, V.L. Govorov, D.S. Sukhorukov, Yu.A. Yashin, S.F. Akhromeyev, V.G. Kulikov, S.K. Kurkotkin, N.V. Ogarkov, V.I. Petrov, S.L. Sokolov, I.G. Pavlovskiy, and I.N. Shkadov.